ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED001975
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: N.A.
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A.
4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Desegregation: Some Propostions and Research Suggestions
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.
7. EDITOR(S): Suchman, Edward A., Dean, John P., and Williams, Rowin M., Jr.
8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington
ST. Avenue, New York,
CITY, STATE New York
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue New York, New York

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	1958	128

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☒ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☒
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA
15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: Report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)
intergroup relations
social stratification
community power
public opinion
prejudice
minority community
school desegregation
personality studies
small-group analysis
base-line studies
field studies
desegregation
research

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The guide was divided into two parts. The first is entitled: "The General Propositions and Their Implications," a list of those social science propositions or findings which had greatest relevance to desegregation. The second, "Research on Desegregation," evaluates the major research approaches in the light of past and present success in the study of intergroup relations, and gives examples of specific research studies which were most needed at the present time.

"The General Propositions and Their Implications" included the areas of social stratification, power in the community, public opinion and propaganda, interaction and communication, prejudice and personality, and the minority community.

The research section included cross-community comparisons, detailed studies of communities, case studies of school desegregation, and individual behavior and attitude surveys. Also included were personality studies, communication and propaganda analysis, small-group analysis, and situational analysis.

The specific kinds of studies were base-line studies. A panel of 250-300 communities and their school systems, stratified by region, size of city, and ratio of white to Negro were studied. The selected community studies used case studies of school desegregation and systematic questionnaire studies. The special field studies covered overt conflict and violence, desegregation efforts that failed, and unusually successful desegregation efforts.

ERIC No.
18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.
22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

2

ERIC Form 1

DESEGREGATION & INTERGROUP RELATIONS
RESEARCH (COMPILATIONS & DIGESTS

ED001975

desegregation: some propositions and research suggestions

Prepared by ***EDWARD A. SUCHMAN, JOHN P. DEAN, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.***

with the assistance of ***MORRIS ROSENBERG, LOIS DEAN*** *and* ***ROBERT JOHNSON***

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch
Bennett O. Stalvey

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DESEGREGATION:
SOME PROPOSITIONS
AND RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS

Prepared by

EDWARD A. SUCHMAN
JOHN P. DEAN
ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
with the assistance of
Morris Rosenberg, Lois Dean and Robert Johnson

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, NEW YORK

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 58-10313

Copyright—1958

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH
515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

Introduction 5

Part I. The General Propositions and Their Implications 9

1. Social Stratification 11
2. Power in the Community 21
3. Public Opinion and Propaganda 33
4. Interaction and Communication 47
5. Prejudice and Personality 57
6. The Minority Community 67

Part II. Research on Desegregation 77

A. RESEARCH APPROACHES 81

7. Cross-Community Comparisons 83
8. Detailed Studies of Communities 85
9. Case Studies of School Desegregation 87
10. Individual Behavior and Attitude Surveys 89
11. Personality Studies 93
12. Communication and Propaganda Analysis 97
13. Case Studies of Collective Behavior 99
14. Small-Group Analysis 101
15. Situational Analysis 103
16. Action Research 107
17. Conclusions on Research Approaches 109

B. SELECTED RESEARCH STUDIES 117

18. Base-Line Studies 119
19. Selected Community Studies 121
20. Special Field Studies 127

Introduction

The United States Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, against segregation in the public schools ranks as one of the most socially significant legal actions in the history of our nation. Any historic event as momentous as this is bound to have important implications for the social sciences. On the one hand, these sciences will be asked to offer the best of their available knowledge to those individuals concerned with implementing so drastic a social change. And, on the other hand, the scope of the change itself will create an opportunity for the behavioral sciences to test and expand existing knowledge.

This treatise relates to both of the above interests. It attempts to summarize existing social science knowledge relevant to desegregation as a social process and to indicate briefly the implications of such knowledge for the actual course of desegregation. On the basis of this review and evaluation of current knowledge, various approaches for research on desgregation are appraised. Finally, a series of specific hypotheses are suggested together with examples of possible research projects.

First, a few words of caution. From the point of view of basic science, the propositions listed do *not* represent a comprehensive and systematic summary of the field of intergroup relations. Many propositions of little or indirect relevance to the current problem of desegregation have been omitted. From the point of view of practical application, the implications of these propositions for the practitioner should be taken merely as suggestive. These suggestions must be viewed with extreme care and only as general guide lines. Only in combination with specific knowledge of a local community setting could they be used as directives for action. Finally, the approaches, hypotheses and studies suggested are more in the nature of significant directions for research rather than actual models for research projects. These examples of possible research need careful translation into operational hypotheses and specific research designs.

The present monograph is intended mainly as a possible stimulant to research and as a suggestive guide to action. It needs careful appraisal by social scientists and practitioners according to the following criteria:

1. How much agreement exists among social scientists as to to the "level of confidence" with which the various basic propositions can be accepted?

2. How much agreement exists among practitioners as to the relevance and advisability of action techniques based upon these propositions?

3. How significant for theory and useful for practice are the research studies suggested? What is the relative degree of their feasibility and urgency?

The contents of this monograph are divided into two main sections. Part I, "*The General Propositions and Their Implications*," lists those social science propositions or findings which have greatest relevance to desegregation. Part II, "*Research on Desegregation*," evaluates each of the major research approaches in the light of their past and present success in the study of intergroup relations and offers examples of specific research studies which, it is felt, are most needed at the present time.

This treatise has presented the authors with many difficulties in a field as unsystematic as intergroup relations, and in relation to an event as undetermined as desegregation. The task has been further complicated by the need to keep two audiences in mind—the social scientist contemplating research, and the professional practitioner actually involved in desegregation activities. The criteria of both theoretical relevance and practical utility, however, have required highly sensitive and rigorous evaluations of the state of intergroup relations knowledge. On the one hand, many of the so-called "basic principles" sounded flat and meaningless when applied to a concrete social event such as desegregation, while many of the seemingly important rules-of-thumb were found to lack a significant theoretical basis. This is precisely the challenge of the present situation—research on educational change in the South should provide an excellent testing ground for both existing theory and practice.

A painstaking attempt has been made to state these propositions and research suggestions in neutral terms. This has not been easy. We have, however, deliberately tried to eliminate bias and to set a tone of objective scientific evaluation. Many of these propositions and hypotheses need to be appraised by the honest-but-critical reader who will ask constantly, "How do you know?" and "What will you really learn from the research?"

All knowledge is a double-edged sword—it carries with it the power to hurt as well as to help. Both the dictator and the democratic leader work from the same set of social science principles. Thus it may be that for a small minority in the South the information contained in this treatise will suggest ways of circumventing or defeating the successful integration of Negroes into southern schools. But scientific research must always run the risk of being used in the service of differing values.

Acknowledgments present a difficult problem in an area as new as desegregation. The present draft of propositions in Part I makes liberal use of the work of many individuals and, in several cases, proper specific credit may have been unknowingly overlooked. A special problem exists in relation to the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations. Many of the ideas presented here represent findings and hypotheses resulting from seven years of intensive research in this area. There is a natural reluctance to state these ideas unaccompanied by argument and before the analysis of the data is completed. However, the urgency of the present situation necessitates that we forego the usual professional reticence and expose our ideas to criticism before the research has been completed.

This monograph was made possible through a grant from the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation. Grateful acknowledgment is given to the SSSP Committee on Intergroup Relations, especially its chairman, Warren Breed, for encouragement in preparing this monograph for publication, and to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for support of the publication. The research conducted by the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations, which constitutes the source of many of the ideas presented, has been supported by the Rockefeller Foundation. An analysis of the specific application of these ideas to the practice of intergroup relations was aided by a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation. None of these groups or agencies, of course, is responsible for the views expressed here.

EDWARD A. SUCHMAN
JOHN P. DEAN
ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
FEBRUARY, 1957

PART I

The General Propositions and Their Implications

This first section lists those social science propositions which, it is believed, are most significant for an understanding of the process of desegregation. Illustrative, rather than definitive, bibliographical references will be given for these propositions. Following each listing is a brief summary which points out the most relevant implications of the propositions for the specific problem of desegregation of public schools.

The propositions have been classified under six general headings as follows: (1) Social Stratification; (2) Power in the Community; (3) Public Opinion and Propaganda; (4) Interaction and Communication; (5) Prejudice and Personality; and (6) The Minority Community. These appear to be the areas of social science knowledge which are most closely related to desegregation. While an attempt has been made to minimize overlap, some repetition was inevitable if each section were to constitute a self-contained, coherent unit.

CHAPTER 1.

Social Stratification

Social stratification is the differential ranking of the people in a particular social system, as superior or inferior, relative to one another in certain socially important respects.[1] In the United States, race is an important determinant of position in the stratification system. In this section, certain selected principles of ascription and achievement, social mobility, and stratified interaction, which bear particularly on the issue of desegregation are presented.

A. Ascription and Achievement

1. In the United States there are many standardized criteria for evaluating people and for ranking them in a status hierarchy.[2] These include: prestige of occupation, size of income, type of income, ownership of property, length and type of education, neighborhood, type and size of residence, status of associates, leisure patterns, and many more.[3] One of the most important criteria of status rank in the United States, but only one, is race.[4]

2. The various ethnic and racial groups in the United States occupy a fairly well defined rank in the status hierarchy.[5] The Negro consistently ranks very low on such status scales.[6]

3. The differential status of Negros and whites is based, to some extent, on ascription (what the individual is, irrespective of his own efforts) rather than on achievement (what he does).[7]

4. The most extreme form of stratification system based on ascription is a caste system, in which an individual's status is fixed on the basis of his heredity and cannot be changed during his lifetime.[8] Negro-white relations in the United States possess this particular characteristic of the caste system, namely, that the Negro cannot advance through his own efforts and merit membership within the white group, although mobility within the Negro group exists.[9]

5. Groups which attain higher status tend to develop a rationale based on some hereditary or inherent characteristic—old family, nobility lineage, race, caste—thus changing the basis of status assignment from achievement to ascription.[10]

6. Social stratification systems, once formed, tend to be relatively stable and resistant to change.

B. Social Mobility

1. A fundamental principle of the American class system is social mobility—the opportunity to rise in the status hierarchy.[11] When relations between Negro and white approximate a caste system, no such mobility is possible, since achievement cannot overcome barriers imposed by birth.

2. In the United States one of the most important channels for social mobility is occupational achievement and success. Occupations differ in socially defined ways in terms of prestige, power and income, which are themselves important criteria of status and which tend to go along roughly with occupational status.[12] Negroes tend to fill the occupational positions ranking lowest in terms of prestige, power, and income.[13]

3. Education ranks as a factor of outstanding significance in determining ultimate occupational position. Middle-class white-collar jobs tend to be filled by people with a high school or college education. At those higher occupational levels which require technical and professional skills, college education, and often postgraduate training, is indispensable. The higher managerial and supervisory positions are increasingly being filled by people with college training.[14] Negroes tend to have a low educational level.[15] This accounts in part for their low occupational position.[16] Thus they incur the disadvantages stemming from the inferior prestige, power, and income of these positions.

4. One of the factors essential for acceptance into higher status circles is what is called "style of life," which includes speech, manners, interests, dress, acquaintance with music, art, literature, and various conventional forms of behavior. Many of these aspects of "style of life" are learned in the educational system.[17] Any group with low educational attainments, such as the Negroes, is thereby placed at a disadvantage in any efforts to rise in the status hierarchy.

5. Status groups tend to develop characteristically distinct "styles of life" and, to some extent, this is true of caste in America. In terms of standardized class criteria, the Negro group has a larger proportion of its members in the lower classes than whites.[18] It is thus possible that many middle-class whites who criticize Negro behavior are misinterpreting a class "style of life" as characteristic racial behavior. Since education can assist Negroes in improving their class positions, it may also gradually reduce the social distance

between the races by bringing about more similar "styles of life."[19]

6. Occupational level, which is the key element in American social status, is to a certain extent, inherited.[20] In terms of standardized class criteria, Negroes tend to belong to the lower classes. Hence, the factors which block the lower-class individual from achieving occupational success would also probably apply to most Negroes, even if segregation were abolished.

7. Aside from the factor of native capacities, some of the reason why lower-class children tend to end up at the lower occupational levels would be the following:

a) The upper-class child's family and class background provide him with superior resources of capital, credit, or contacts, which are particularly helpful at the start of one's career.[21]

b) Upper-class children are more likely to be able to afford the costs of college, as well as the deferment of income for several years, than are those from the lower classes.[22]

c) Not lesser opportunity alone, but lower *motivation* as well, accounts for the lower rate of entrance into college of the lower classes. It is part of the lower-class value system to place less emphasis on the importance of formal education.[23]

8. College entrance depends in large part upon performance and training in high school. Some of the reasons why the upper-class student is more likely to remain in school, to obtain higher grades, and to select the proper courses would be the following:

a) The lower classes tend to select vocational and commercial courses, rather than college preparatory courses, which effectively debars them from college.[24] In addition, some school authorities foster this pattern by advising students to select programs on the basis of their social class positions.

b) The schools are run by middle-class teachers and higher personnel, who tend to be oriented toward, and to favor, the children of middle and upper-middle class.[25] The working-class children, including the many Negroes in this group, find the schools less suited to their interests and needs;[26] this is one reason why they leave school relatively early.

c) Teacher favoritism toward children of the upper classes finds expression in the differential imposition of discipline as well. Hollingshead cites cases showing particularly harsh discipline toward lower-class children and lenient discipline toward upper-class students for similar offenses.[27] Such practices make school a more disagreeable experience for the former group, and contribute toward their early departure from school.

d) Family economic pressure may often induce the lower-class student either to leave school for a job, or to work after school. If he works after school, he may have to forego many of the satisfying extra-curricular activities, and this will probably decrease his incentive to continue his studies.

C. *Stratified Interaction*

1. A status group is considered one whose members can have intimate social access to one another. Put in other terms, a person's status is defined by the people he can potentially associate with on a level of intimacy.[28] Consequently, whites who associate with Negroes on a level of intimacy are likely to lose status in a white group which defines Negroes as a low-status group. Conversely, it helps to account, in some cases, for the behavior of certain mobile Negroes who strive to associate with whites.

2. A fundamental criterion of stratification is *exclusiveness;* the higher group seeks to separate itself from the lower group.[29] The high status of many groups and associations is defined in terms of the care taken to reject or exclude lower-status people. Various forms of restriction and segregation illustrate the principle of status exclusiveness.

3. Bans on personal contact, particularly those which are interpreted as equal-status interactions, appear in the United States in the segregation of places of eating, bathing facilities, vehicles of transportation, houses, hotels, movies, *and schools.*[30] Where the sentiments against such personal contact are strong, they are extremely difficult to overcome.

4. The rank order of discrimination is strongest at the level of greatest intimacy and becomes progressively weaker as it refers to more impersonal issues. However, there may be a good deal of face-to-face interaction between the races which does not threaten the stratification system, because the interaction situation is defined as one involving inequality of status.[31]

5. The highest level of intimacy of an equal-status contact is achieved in marriage. Members of the same immediate family almost always have the same status.[32] Hence, racial intermarriage is the most extreme threat to status differentiation and, as such, it is most vigorously resisted by the group occupying the superior status position.

6. Segregation tends to heighten identification with the in-

group and disidentification with the out-group; it thus stresses the sense of difference between groups.

7. The maintenance of physical distance is an effective and frequently-used device for maintaining status exclusiveness. Segregation is an example of the use of physical distance to maintain social distance.

8. The greater the familiarity and knowledge of people with one another, the more likely are individuals to be evaluated in terms of total status judgments. An increase of familiarity with *individuals* of the other race, which would probably attend desegregation, might tend to substitute total for segmental status judgments between whites and Negroes. In addition, the norm of competition, characteristic of the American school system, promotes evaluations in terms of achievement; it might thus be expected to weaken the importance of the segmental criterion of race.[33]

9. Members of the same ethnic groups tend to band together in cliques.[34] This has the effect of maintaining relatively exclusive status groups. Those of higher status tend to dominate the formal extracurricular activities; this has the effect of making the lower-status member feel unwanted, and reduces the satisfactions he can potentially obtain in school.[35] This pattern would probably apply in Negro-white relations, in which the status position is still more clearly defined.

10. In mixed housing projects in the North, physical proximity has been shown to be a more important determinant of equal-status association than race.[36] A similar effect is possible under other forms of desegregation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DESEGREGATION

A major channel for social mobility in the highly industrial-commercial American society is occupational achievement. One of the most important entries into a high-prestige occupation is the educational system. Since desegregation should equalize educational success, it will probably broaden the goal of equality of opportunity.

Although there are some elements of a caste system in Negro-white relationships, the basic structure of American society is favorable to the ideology of occupational achievement. There is a high degree of commerce, and the economic market is relatively indifferent to status considerations; it is the merit of the product or service, rather than the characteristics of the producer, which tends to be evaluated on the market. The high degree of occupational specialization also encourages the grant of rewards on the basis of merit rather than of status. Thus, if desegregation improves the education of the Negro and thereby improves his occupational training, it could ultimately result in a rise of his status in the society.

When improved education and higher occupational levels of Negroes results in a "style of life" which more closely approximates the dominant white middle-class model, then will the sense of difference between the two groups decrease in intensity.

Equal educational opportunity is a necessary condition for raising the occupational and social status of Negroes, but it is not sufficient in itself. Under conditions of desegregation, the white teachers may tend to give preferential treatment to white children, and, indeed, Negro teachers may favor Negroes. A related question is the problem of generating motivation for educational success. Consideration must be given to the question of making the desegregated school a rewarding and stimulating experience for both Negroes and whites. Unless this problem of motivation is solved, desegregation will not achieve its goal of providing equality of opportunity.

Status equality, for the Negro group as a whole, will ultimately depend on achievement in the higher occupations, for which access to the higher educational levels is a prerequisite. Desegregation, to a certain extent, fosters equality of opportunity and, therefore, it may result in keener competition for those occupations which provide greater prestige, power, and income. We might thus expect the whites, who are currently quite free of this competition from Negroes, to resist desegregation insofar as they recognize these implications.

Desegregation does not automatically entail mutual acceptance by the races. The possibility of "voluntary" segregation remains, with whites sitting together in one part of the room and Negroes in another (as in segregation in buses, trains, movies, etc.). If such a pattern were to evolve, as it well might, the result might simply be a change from one form of segregation to another, rather than actual integration. Physical proximity among people in the same formal position tends to result in mutual social acceptance. Desegregation will probably have the effect of putting Negroes and whites in the same status groups to a greater extent than at present; this would tend to modify the community status structure.

Different status groups tend to develop different attitudes and "styles of life"; hence, personal contact between them at the outset is often uncomfortable because of the absence of shared ideas, meanings, and symbols. However, since it is the school that usually develops these common ways of thought through identical teaching, these feelings of uneasiness and discomfort would be expected to decrease, and interaction on the basis of equality should increase.

The resistance to desegregation is often firmly rooted in the deepest sentiments of the people. Probably the most effective way of unlearning such a reaction is through personal contact, as under conditions of desegregation. Desegregation establishes an opportunity for Negro and white children to develop lasting attachments, although, of course, there is no assurance that many of these will occur. Rational argument will seldom be effective in changing the attitudes of whites who have learned feelings of revulsion toward close contact with Negroes; enforced contact, as in desegregation, will probably overcome this feeling, but it will take time and it will not be easy.

1. Talcott Parsons, "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification," *Essays in Social Theory* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), p. 166.
2. Raymond B. Cattell cites over twenty criteria of social status in "The Concept of Social Status," *Jour. Soc. Psych.*, Vol. 5, (1942), pp. 294-295. Reinhard Bendix and S. M. Lipset in *Class, Status, and Power: a Reader in Social Stratification* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953) indicate in their title that they consider economic class, social status, and power to be the essential stratification dimensions.
3. These are mentioned at various points throughout: W. Lloyd Warner and Paul Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1941), and W. Lloyd Warner and Associates, *Democracy in Jonesville* (New York: Harpers, 1949).
4. Cattell, *op. cit.*, p. 294 and August B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth* (New York: John Wiley, 1949), p. 79.
5. Theodore M. Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (New York: Dryden, 1950), p. 280, comments: "The order of preference for various ethnic groups is remarkably consistent in all parts of this country. Not only does it vary little geographically; it has also changed very little during the last quarter of a century, according to available evidence."
6. For example, Emory S. Bogardus, *Immigration and Race Attitudes* (Boston: Heath, 1928); Eugene L. Hartley, *Problems in Prejudice* (New York: King's Crown, 1946); J. P. Guilford, "Racial Preferences of a Thousand American University Students," *Jour. Soc. Psych.*, Vol. 2 (1931), pp. 179-204. In Warner and Lunt, *op. cit.*, p. 225, the Negro group is the only one of ten ethnic groups which has all its members in the lower-lower class.
7. The distinction between ascription and achievement was first introduced into social science literature, according to Cuber, by Ralph

Linton, *The Study of Man* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1936). It has since become basic to stratification literature. See, for example, John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel, *Social Stratification in the United States* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), p. 4, and Kingsley Davis, *Human Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), pp. 97-117.

8. See, for example, Kingsley Davis, *op. cit.*, pp. 377-386, and W. Lloyd Warner, "American Caste and Class," *Amer. Jour. Soc.*, Vol. XLIII, pp. 234-237.
9. Kingsley Davis, *op. cit.*, argues that Negro-white relations do possess caste-like features; George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (New York: Harpers, 1953), deny it is a caste system; and Cuber and Kenkel take an intermediate position saying that "We see no serious objection to referring to the American Negro group as a caste . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 14; Davis, Gardner, and Gardner, *Deep South* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1941), use the term "caste" throughout their work, and this term is also adopted by Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harpers, 1944), throughout his work.
10. Davis, Gardner, and Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-20, cite the following justifications for Negro inferiority: inherent inferiority; the will of God; unsocialized beings; childlike behavior. For a rather complete discussion of this question, see Myrdal, *op. cit.*, Ch. 4, esp. pp. 103-104.
11. See W. Lloyd Warner, *American Life: Dream and Reality* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953), Ch. 5.
12. Robin M. Williams, Jr., *American Society* (New York: Knopf, 1951), p. 393, observes that in American society, which is characterized by relatively high social mobility, ". . . position in the scale of social stratification basically depends upon occupational achievement. . ." Richard Centers, *The Psychology of Social Classes* (Princeton Univ., 1949), Ch. 6, shows that various occupations are rather consistently classified as belonging to certain classes. Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, Jobs and Occupations: a Popular Evaluation," *Sociological Analysis*, edited by L. Wilson and W. L. Kolb (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949), pp. 464-473; is a study showing the differential rank of various occupations.
13. C. Wright Mills, *White Collar* (New York: Oxford Univ., 1951), p. 248, reports: "The number of Negroes in white-collar jobs is negligible." The occupation and economic inferiority of Negroes in the United States is exhaustively documented by Myrdal, *op. cit.*, in Part IV. The author states "The economic situation of the Negroes in America is pathological. Except for a small minority enjoying upper- and middle-class status, the masses of American Negroes, in the rural South and in the segregated slum quarters in Southern and Northern cities, are destitute. They own little property. . . . Their incomes are not only low, but also irregular. . . . Non-agricultural Negro workers are, for the most part, either in low-paid service occupations or have menial tasks in industry. Few are skilled workers." (pp. 205-206).
14. W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B. Loeb, *Who Shall Be Educated?* (New York: Harpers, 1944), pp. 36-37 and

passim. ". . . the American school and college system is the greatest agency we have for equalizing opportunity and for promoting the rise of able young people." (p. 157) And Mills, *op. cit.*, notes: "In the white-collar life and its patterns of success, the educational segment of the individual's career becomes a key to his entire occupational fate. . . . Almost all occupational mobility requires education." (pp. 266-267). See also the discussion of "Social Status and Education," in C. P. Loomis and J. A. Beegle, *Rural Social Systems* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), pp. 500-504.

15. In their report published in 1944, Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb, *op. cit.*, p. 122, note that "In ten Southern states, $49 is spent on a white's education and $17 on a Negro's. In Mississippi and Georgia, only $9 is expended on a Negro child's education." Citing the *Deep South* study, Warner reports that the field workers estimated ". . . that at least half the rural colored population of Old County and a higher proportion in Rural County were illiterate." (p. 131). Documentation of the inferior Negro educational level may be found in Myrdal, *op. cit.*, pp. 942-952. More recent evidence is available, however, to indicate that, between 1940 and 1952, the expenditures for Negro school children in southern states has, relative to the white children, improved considerably. These same data indicate, however, that equality still does not exist. See Harry Ashmore, *The Negro and the Schools* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina, 1954), esp. pp. 153, 155, 156, 159.
16. For example, Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb, *op. cit.*: "By depriving the Negroes of adequate educational facilities and by contributing only a minimum of educational opportunity, the whites constantly subordinate the Negroes." (p. 137).
17. The concept of "style of life" has achieved sociological prominence to an important extent as a result of Max Weber's discussion of this subject in his analysis of status groups. See Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford Univ., 1946), pp. 187-188. This concept permeates all the works of the Warner School and is a central aspect of their stratification scheme. See, for example, Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb, *op. cit.*, Ch. VII.
18. Warner, Havighurst, and Loeb, *op. cit.*, p. 10. See also Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*
19. This possibility is suggested by the findings of Allison Davis and Robert J. Havighurst, "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. XI, pp. 698-710. One of their conclusions is: "There are significant differences in child-rearing practices between the middle and lower social classes in a large city. The same type of differences exist between middle- and lower-class Negroes as between middle- and lower-class whites."
20. Richard Centers, "Occupational Mobility of Urban Occupational Strata," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. 13, (1948).
21. See, for example, the discussion of the Parks family in Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1953); and the X family in Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd,

Middletown in Transition (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937).

22. Elbridge Sibley, "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. 7, (1942), pp. 322-330.
23. Herbert Hyman, "The Values Systems of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification," in Bendix and Lipset, *op. cit.*, pp. 429-432, and Hollingshead, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-178.
24. Hollingshead, *Ibid.*, pp. 168-172.
25. Warner, Havighurst and Loeb, *op. cit.*, p. 119; Hollingshead, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-126.
26. Hollingshead, *Ibid.*, Ch. 8-9, *passim.*
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 185-192.
28. Gregory P. Stone and William H. Form, "Instabilities in Status: the Problem of Hierarchy in the Community Study of Status Arrangements," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. 18, (1953), pp. 150-151, have clarified this question by distinguishing between *status groups* (which are "communal in nature, and, consequently, their members are in relatively frequent social contact with one another") and *status aggregates* ("an inclusive category referring to a number of individuals enjoying approximately the same honor in a community, but who are in potential, capricious, occasional or sporadic social contact.").
29. Max Weber, in Gerth and Mills, *op. cit.*, pp. 190-191, maintains that "status honor . . . always rests on distance and exclusiveness . . ." Carson McGuire, "Social Stratification and Mobility Patterns," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. 15, (1950), p. 195, states: "From a theoretical point of view, social stratification is a special case of principles of inclusion and exclusion which characterize systems of human behavior." See also Stone and Form, *op. cit.*, p. 151.
30. See the discussion of "Social Segregation and Discrimination," by Myrdal, *op. cit.*, Ch. 29. There is, of course, considerable variation in these patterns of discrimination in the South. See Charles S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harpers, 1943).
31. Myrdal, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61.
32. Kingsley Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 111; W. Lloyd Warner, Marchia Meeker, and Kenneth Eells, in *Social Class in America* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949), p. 10. That the ban on intermarriage is the hardest core of the caste stratification system is affirmed by many writers. See, for example, Myrdal, *op. cit.*, p. 60. Davis, Gardner, and Gardner, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-26.
33. Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status," *Amer. Jour. Soc.*, Vol. 45, (1939), pp. 171-182.
34. Loomis and Beegle, *op. cit.*, discuss the influence of class and nationality factors on interaction among school children, pp. 504-511. See also Hollingshead, *op. cit.*, Ch. 9.
35. Hollingshead, *Ibid.*, pp. 192-203.
36. Morton Deutsch and Mary Evans Collins, "The Effect of Public Policy in Housing Projects upon Interracial Attitudes," *Readings in Social Psychology*, (Revised edition), G. Swanson, T. N. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (New York: Holt, 1952), pp. 582-594.

CHAPTER 2.

Power in the Community

The problem of desegregation is to a large extent a problem of power. The decision of the Supreme Court represents an exercise of power, and the implementation of this ruling will reflect the ability of the Court to induce community leaders and school administrators to behave in accord with its intentions.

Power is a fundamental form of social interaction, permeating every aspect of social life. While there is a widespread tendency in American society to view power with suspicion, the requirements of social control and social coordination make the exercise of power indispensable to society.

The following propositions deal with four broad areas of power and the way it is exercised: (A) The dimensions of power, (B) The forms of power, (C) The criteria of power, and (D) The operation of the power system.

A. The Dimensions of Power

1. A person may be said to have power to the extent that he influences the behavior of others in accordance with his own intention.[1]

2. Power is one specific form of *influence*, characterized by the presence of the element of intention. Influence, more broadly, may be considered the impact which one person has upon another, irrespective of intention.[2]

3. It is customary to think of power as *positive* power, i.e., getting people to do what you want them to do. But it would represent an oversight to neglect two other types of power—*filter* power and *veto* power. By selectively exposing the power-wielder to certain people, facts, or points of view, the filterer, i.e., secretary or advisor, may significantly influence what is done or not done about many important matters.

In speaking of veto power,[3] we mean that an individual may not be able to get people to do what he wants, but he may be able to prevent them from doing what they want. An obvious example is the senatorial filibuster. The holder of veto power is capable of nullifying a good deal of otherwise effective work.

4. Power may be *mediate* or *immediate*, i. e., the power-wielder may influence the power-subject directly, or be may have to influence one person who, in turn, must influence a second, and so on down the line until the object of intention is reached. The mediator is the "middleman" of power.

5. Power, may be *overt* or *concealed*. The public official who is under the control of a political boss, or who behaves in accordance with the intention of people with special interests to serve, will not reveal that his actions are controlled by these people. Similarly, the "power behind the throne" may be a publicly inconspicuous individual.

B. *The Forms of Power*

1. The power-subject may yield to the power-wielder's intention either *willingly* or *unwillingly*. Most power in society is *willing power;* such power can be subdivided into authoritative forms of power and non-authoritative forms of power.[4]

2. *Unwilling power*—The most obvious reason for one person to carry out the will of another is *coercion*. Whether violence, expulsion, penalization, deprivation or other forms of sanction are employed by the power-wielder, the common characteristic is that the power subject does not want to behave in accord with the other's intentions, but feels compelled to do so. Under these circumstances, the sense of abridgement of freedom (or, as Simmel calls it, "spontaneity"[5]), is strongest.

3. *Willing power*—There are a number of reasons why a person will raise no objection to other people telling him what to do. Some of these can be subsumed under the heading of *authority* —the acknowledgment of the other's *right* to direct our actions. There are several different bases upon which this right may be founded.

a) The first form of authoritative power is based on the power-subject's *respect or admiration for the power-wielder*. This may be called *charismatic-competence* power. Charismatic authority, as Max Weber has shown, is characterized by loyalty and devotion to a leader, based on an emotional attachment to an individual invested with a magnetic personality who is assumed to be fulfilling a "mission."[6] The authority of competence is also founded upon respect for the power-wielder, but it has a more intellectual, and less emotional, base than charismatic authority. One person follows another's direction out of respect for the latter's superior ability, knowledge, experience, skill, competence, etc.

b) A second form of authority lies in the recognition of the *functional* necessity for following the directions of a person in a particular position. Functional power is a particularly useful form of social power, for it tends to be relatively rational and frictionless.

c) The third form of authority—*traditional legitimation*[7]— is rooted in the very process of socialization. As people are socialized in a culture, they become aware that certain institutional groups or individuals have power and characteristically control their behavior. This power relationship becomes one of the many frames of reference within which they organize their lives. By feeling that whatever is, is right (i.e., legitimate), they come to accept the power of persons in certain statuses and offices as an unquestionable fact, as little subject to attack as the laws of nature.[8]

d) The final form of authority might be called, using the term very broadly, *contractual* power. Probably the most common operation of this principle appears in those cases in which one person purchases the behavior of another. Part of the meaning of the statement that "money is power" is that, for a sum, one person has the right to influence the behavior of another in accordance with his own intentions. We may say that any inducement which one person offers to another (money, prestige, love, security, etc.) which gives this other person power over him would be subsumed under the general heading of contractual power.

4. *Non-authoritative power*—There are certain types of power characterized by the fact that one person behaves in accord with the intention of another but does not acknowledge this other person's *right* to tell him what to do.

a) One of the most common forms of *non-authoritative* power is *persuasion*. In an age of mass communications, this source of power acquires particular importance. In this case, the characteristics of the power-wielder—his magnetism, ability, status, etc.—are relevant only insofar as they influence persuasive effectiveness; it is the argument which counts.

b) The final form of willing power occurs when the power-subject carries out the intention of the power-wielder without knowing that he is doing so. This form of power exercise has been called manipulation.

5. From the viewpoint of the power-wielder, authority is the most desirable form of power, and power-wielders characteristically seek to transform coercive or non-authoritative power into authoritative power. The disadvantage of coercion is that it tends to involve the dangers of resistance, sabotage, slowdown, and revolu-

tion and results in the stifling of initiative. The chief disadvantage of persuasion or manipulation as power instruments lies in the incertitude of the control and the frequent lack of effectiveness in controlling behavior precisely.

6. The type of power employed will vary with the needs of the social functions to be performed. Coercive or authoritative power, rather than non-authoritative power, is most likely to be employed under the following conditions:

a) When a refined division of labor exists, requiring the coordination of diverse skills (e.g., in a factory).

b) When it is necessary to concentrate many people at a single task, particularly under emergency conditions (a military battle, a fire).

c) When the standard or criterion of success is immediate, tangible, and clear-cut, rather than vague or nebulous (producing an automobile or capturing an enemy position, as opposed to producing a "good" child or a "moral" man).

C. Criteria of Power

1. Whether one form of power is "best" can only be answered if we specify the criteria upon which the evaluation is to be made. Three important criteria are: (1) feasibility; (2) effectiveness; and (3) ethical acceptability.

2. Many forms of power which rate well on one criterion will rate poorly on another. The question concerning the best form of power to employ must be answered, then, in terms of the relative weight given to the various criteria.

3. The analyst of power has no mandate to say whether effectiveness or ethical status is a more important criterion in the selection of a particular form, but he can seek to clarify the alternatives available. Probably any solution is an imperfect one in terms of one of the relevant criteria. The key conflict is whether one uses unethical means in order to achieve ends that are seen as worthwhile.

D. The Operation of the Power System

1. In any given society, power tends to be concentrated in the hands of people occupying important positions in key institutions. In a theocratic society, the greatest power will be in the hands of the upper levels of the priesthood. In a predominantly militaristic society, the higher officers hold power. In a commercial-industrial society, people at the decision-making level in business are the founts of power.

2. It is common practice to think of the government as the chief source of power,[9] because the state possesses a monopoly over the legitimate means of physical force within a given territory[10] and the law has the sanction of traditional authority. In many cases, however, the state exercises *mediate* power stemming from other central power sources—organized business power, labor power, farm power, criminal power, etc.

3. The pressure group is an agency designed to translate the will of its leaders into the actions of the government,[11] which in turn influences the behavior of the power-subject. It may seek to exercise positive power, filter power, or veto power.

4. In an advanced industrial-commercial society, such as American society, one of the chief loci of power is in the hands of businessmen,[12] who may exercise persuasion, the authority of competence, or contractual power over government officials.[13]

5. In some cases the men of power have the machinery of government almost directly at their bidding.[14] Their ability to influence others is enormously enhanced by control over this important mediating agency.

6. The number of men involved in power decisions undoubtedly varies from community to community. In a relatively small community, a single family may exercise most of the power. In larger cities, several dozen men may be involved. The top power leaders, however, usually have access to one another, choose one another, and, with reference to community decisions, tend to "clear" their decisions with the others before consulting the understructure personnel.[15]

7. Leaders of community organizations may have prominence and publicity, but they are not usually the men of power.[16] The men of power tend to shun the limelight of publicity which goes to the second and third level of power personnel. They also tend to avoid involvement in the details of executing policy, delegating the exercise of mediate power to the under-structure personnel.[17]

8. In the community, a top power leader who makes a community decision tends to clear it with the other top power leaders, often on an informal level. Once the policy or line has been established, there tends to be general conformity to this framework.[18]

9. With reference to any specific community decision, there are likely to be only one or two "prime movers"; however, they seek to obtain either the tacit approval or active cooperation of the other top power leaders.

10. People at the high power levels tend to be resistant to

social change of a serious sort. The prevailing attitude among these people is, "Don't rock the boat."

11. The interrelationships among the institutions of power are extremely complex. Although business power is probably dominant in American society, a full-fledged analysis of power must also take into consideration the forces of organized political power, labor power, military power, criminal power, and religious power. People high in these various hierarchies will have power corresponding to the strength of the institutions.

12. The power leaders in various communities have contacts with other power leaders which cut across community lines. Such association, however, tends to be loose and sporadic, and probably does not constitute a well-knit unified national power structure.[19]

13. With regard to the measurement of power, at least four factors should be considered in estimating the power of an individual or group:

a) *Number of people*: All other things being equal, the person who can influence the behavior of many people in accord with his own intentions has greater power than the one who can influence but few.[20]

b) *Scope of lives*: In certain areas, the life scope of the individuals which the power-wielder may influence may be clearly defined and delimited.

c) *Certitude of control*: Other things equal, we may say that a person who can be sure that others will do what he wants has more power than one who can only hope that they will follow his will. This is one reason why the individual who can invoke immediate, violent, and direct sanctions is usually considered a person of greater power than one who must plead with others to get them to do what he wants. However, this impression is not always correct.

d) The amount of power which one person exercises over another may be conceived of as the difference between how the power-subject actually behaves and how he would have behaved had the power-wielder not sought to exercise his influence. This amount of power corresponds to the amount of resistance which must be overcome.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DESEGREGATION

Forms of Power—There is little doubt that, if the advocates of desegregation succeed in getting reluctant school administrators to implement the Supreme Court policy, they will be exercising power. There is a wide range of alternative power devices which may be used, but not all of them are equally satisfactory in terms of the criteria of power.

It seems probable that the form of power most congenial to the proponents of desegregation is the non-authoritative device of persuasion. The desegregationists would like to convince their opponents that the racist arguments are scientifically baseless, that segregation violates basic American values, that the group which discriminates is harmed as well as the group discriminated against, and so on. There are at least two reasons why persuasion is particularly likely to be viewed with favor. The first is that the goal of power (i.e., desegregation) is not such as to require coercive or authoritative forms of power, although they may be employed. It is not necessary to coordinate diverse skills and the situation is not viewed as an "emergency." The second point is that within the framework of democratic values, rational persuasion is considered the most *ethical* power device. With the development of mass communications, persuasion also becomes a *feasible* form of power.

The main drawback to the use of persuasion lies in its relative *ineffectiveness* in the present situation. Racial prejudice is a deeply-rooted, affect-laden attitude, frequently providing important psychological, social, and economic gratifications to its possessor. The mechanisms of selective exposure, selective perception, and selective understanding make it relatively easy for the prejudiced person to avoid or misinterpret any message directed toward him which is designed to change his attitude. Taking a short time span of a few years, it seems unlikely that persuasion will be effective in changing most people's attitudes toward segregation. In this situation, then, persuasion cannot be considered a particularly effective power device.

Now let us consider the opposite form of power—*coercion*. Given the monopoly over the legitimate means of violence possessed by the state, there is little doubt that coercion is both an effective and feasible solution to the problem of desegregation. There are at least two problems involved in its use, however. Given that aspect of the American Creed which stresses "the value of decisions arrived at by common counsel rather than by violence and brutality," the use of unwilling power will violate the ethical precepts of many people. The repugnance to coercion is so general that most people will consider it only as a last resort, if at all. The second problem is that, in the exercise of coercive power, one must consider the unintentional consequences of such action (i.e., unintentional influence). If physical coercion leads to physical resistance, race riots, lynchings, the solidification of racial prejudice, etc., then, though desegregation may become a fact, many will feel that it has not been worth the consequences. There will be those, then, who will consider the exercise of coercive power both unethical and fraught with dangers.

The power of competence and that of *charism* must be considered also in bringing about desegregation. For example, if a man of Huey Long's influence had taken a stand in favor of desegregation, many of his loyal followers might have accepted his position, not because of *what* he said, but because *he* said it. Under the present circumstances, this would probably be considered an ethical power device, and it might be somewhat effective, but it does not appear to be too feasible. In the first place, there does not appear to be any one or two leaders whose followings are so loyal and so blindly devoted to them that their mere words can overcome the strongly rooted opposition to desegregation. Secondly, those leaders in the South who most strongly partake of charismatic qualities are precisely the ones who are least likely to advance the cause of desegregation. The attempt to exercise charismatic-competence power, therefore, does not appear to be very feasible, and, in any case, it is doubtful whether it would be entirely effective.

Functional power may also operate to some extent to promote desegregation. For example, certain parents may go along with the school principal's plan for desegregation because they feel that it is "his job" to make such a decision and that, unless he is given such power, an orderly school system cannot operate. It is difficult to evaluate the importance of functional power in the schools which have been desegregated, and, in any case, it would be questionable to generalize from this experience to the situation in the deep South. Functional power is an ethical and feasible solution, but it is doubtful whether it is very effective in the present situation.

The application of *contractual power* to desegregation would be exemplified by an offer by the national government to grant a community tax relief or a promise to build a new school and bear other educational expenses on the condition that the community carried through a desegregation program. This is a feasible solution, and it may be more effective than we might at first assume. The reason is that, in a community, the chief men of power are those who have a firm foothold in the industrial and commercial structures, and pay high taxes.

If one were to plant a false rumor that all school administrators who failed to implement the desegregation policy within thirty days would lose their jobs, and if the administrators as a consequence did more to desegregate, we would have an example of *manipulative* power. Although this is a feasible solution, most people would reject the ethics involved. As far as effectiveness is concerned, this would depend on the ingenuity of the manipulator. In the present case, ethics aside, this does not appear to be a very fruitful solution.

The most promising form of authoritative power would appear to be *traditional legitimation.* This is the essence of any power exercised by the Supreme Court. The Court is constituted as a sacred body of interpreters of the written cultural tradition. Most Americans thus unquestioningly accept the *right* of the Supreme Court to render final decisions with regard to questions falling within the constitutional orbit. Traditional legitimation appears to be an ethical, feasible, and effective solution to the problem of desegregation; while it does not rank highest on all three power criteria, it does appear to be the only power device which does adequately satisfy the three specified criteria.

There is, of course, no reason why only a single form of power need be exercised in bringing about desegregation—several may be used in conjunction. Considering only the criterion of effectiveness, however, it still would not be wise to use *all* possible power devices. One reason for this is that one form of power exercise may undermine another. For example, if the power-wielder uses persuasion and traditional legitimation together, the result may be to reduce the effectiveness of the latter form. Once one starts to explain, plead with, cajole, or persuade a person to behave in accord with your intentions, he may no longer accept your *right* to tell him what to do. Persuasion in this case may defeat the exercise of legitimate power. Similarly, if coercion is exercised and is followed by persuasion, the power-subject may be so incensed at the coercion that he becomes completely immune to the persuasive arguments. It is therefore necessary to consider the particular *combination* of power forms (as well as the unintentional consequences of power exercise) in examining the operation of power in the desegregation process.

The Community—The Supreme Court desegregation decision involves the use of mediate power. In the use of mediate power, the danger arises that the intention of the power-wielder may be unconsciously distorted, intentionally subverted, or ineffectively executed by the intermediaries of power. Thus, if the courts decide to grant power to an unsympathetic local officialdom to carry out the desegregation policy, they face the danger that the spirit and letter of the policy will be undermined. Any rupture in this complex link of power can negate the total policy. Consequently, the future success or failure of the desegregation policy is anchored at the local level.

One reason why the community power leaders may be expected to oppose desegregation is simply because the policy is a threat to stability and an omen of change—and change contains the possibility of a redistribution of power. The desegregation policy may be resisted by some powerful people, not on the basis of the inherent principle, but because they may feel uncertain about various dimly perceived general consequences which might threaten to shake the foundations of their power.

The success of the desegregation policy at the local level is likely to depend considerably on the ego-involvement of a small number of power-wielders. Since the power-wielders tend to know one another, to have friendship ties, and to clear policy decisions with one another, it is likely that the group as a whole will decide on some "line" with regard to the desegregation policy. The public pronouncements by those on the lower rungs of power, such as many political officials, heads of social work agencies, and many community organizations and associations are likely to be reflections of the decisions reached at the top power level.

---

1. Herbert Goldhamer and Edward A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status," *Amer. Jour. Soc.*, Vol. 45, (1939), p. 171. This definition is broader and more adequate than those offered by Max Weber. *From Max Weber: Essays In Sociology*, tr. and ed. by H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946), p. 180; and by Robert Bierstedt, who defines power as "latent force," in *An Analysis of Social Power, Amer. Soc. Rev.*, Vol. 15, (1950), p. 733.
2. This interpretation of influence differs radically from that offered by Bierstedt, *Ibid.*, p. 731.
3. For a discussion of veto power, see David Riesman, "Who Has the Power?" in *Class, Status, and Power*, R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, eds. (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 155-160.
4. See the distinction between coercion, authority, and manipulation presented by Goldhamer and Shils, *op. cit.* For discussions of the factors which motivate men to strive after power, see Harold D. Lasswell, *Power and Personality* (New York: Norton, 1948), esp. Ch. III; Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (New York: Rinehart,

1941), esp. pp. 221-239; Karen Horney, *Our Inner Conflicts* (New York: Norton, 1945), Ch. IV, and *Neurosis and Human Growth* (New York: Norton, 1950), Ch. VIII; and various works by Alfred Adler and Friedrich Nietzsche. A power-orientation has also been shown to be a characteristic of authoritarian attitudes in T. Adorno, *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harpers, 1950), pp. 44-45, 148-149.

5. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, tr. and ed. by Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950), p. 182.
6. Max Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 245-248 and 295-296.
7. With a slightly different slant, this concept corresponds to Weber's "traditional authority," *Ibid.*, p. 296.
8. Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1953), p. 247.
9. See, for example, Charles E. Merriam, *Political Power* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1934). On the other hand, Lasswell, *op. cit.*, tends to think of any institution of power as a part of government.
10. Max Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
11. See John F. Cuber and William F. Kenkel, *Social Stratification in the United States* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), pp. 317-318. Two of the best discussions of the operation of lobbies are: Pendleton Herring, *Group Representations Before Congress* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1929) and William Schriftgeisser, *The Lobbyists* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951).
12. For a discussion of business power at the national level, see Robert F. Brady, *Business as a System of Power* (New York: Columbia Univ., 1943). The importance of business power at the local level is documented in Hunter, *op. cit.*, p. 76, and in Robert S. and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), Ch. III.
13. See the classification by Hunter, *op. cit.*, p. 109, of the first to the fourth rate power personnel.
14. See Lynd and Lynd, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-89, for a discussion of the "X-controlled mayors," and Hunter, *op. cit.*, for a discussion of the close relationship between Mayor Barns, Treasurer Worth, and Governor Simpson with the businessmen of Regional City, pp. 81, 102-3, 161-164.
15. Hunter, *Ibid.*, p. 79, notes that for any community-wide issue or project, the top leaders of each power clique "clear" with each other—usually on an informal basis.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 87. "Organizational leaders are prone to get the publicity; the upper echelon economic leaders, the power."
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 37, 87, 110-112.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
19. Kurt Mayer, *Class and Society* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1955), pp. 58-59.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

CHAPTER 3.

Public Opinion and Propaganda

Social change, especially in an area as closely related to the folkways and mores of a society as desegregation, is intimately related to public opinion. What "the public" thinks and how it acts will do much to determine the acceptability and rate of change. But what this public consists of, and when an issue may be thought of as entering the area of public opinion, is subject to much disagreement. This section will examine some of the major propositions dealing with the identification of public opinion, the control of public opinion, and the changing of public opinion through propaganda and other means.

A. Identification of Public Opinion

1. Public opinion is most often conceived of as representing majority opinion.[1] An added condition would require that the minority be willing to accept the point of view of the majority. Other writers, from a more sociological point of view, define public opinion in terms of social interaction and consensus.[2]

2. The following characteristics are most commonly agreed upon as identifying public opinion: a) a form of human behavior; b) verbalization; c) involving *many* individuals; d) involving some universally known object or situation; e) important to many; f) action or readiness to act; g) awareness of others; h) expressed as approval or disapproval; i) conflicting sides.[3]

3. Public opinion implies disagreement and conflict.[4] The extent of controversy will depend upon such factors as: a) A community atmosphere which permits the expression of opinions on both sides of the issue; b) The existence of individuals who have been working both for and against the issue; c) The organization or alignment of formal pressure groups on both sides engaged in active propagandistic activities; d) Public discussion, meetings, etc., that foster open recognition of the issue as "legitimately" controversial; e) News coverage of current developments and the expression of diverse editorial opinion.

4. In the absence of controversy, a public issue may more properly be classified as falling into the area of non-controversial

"mores" rather than public opinion.[5] The "mores" are not usually debatable and reflect the "taken for granted as correct" aspects of social behavior.[6] Much of public opinion represents this type of "biased" belief.[7]

5. The public can be expected to have only a limited knowledge of actual facts. The public lacks the time, the opportunity, the interest, and the ability to collect details of factual information.

6. For the most part public opinion will not be the major effective determinant of community action. This becomes more evident: a) the more the public is characterized by the feeling that they cannot effectively influence the course of events; and b) the more they believe the problem requires expert solution.

7. Public opinion is more capable of dealing with general principles than specific laws. It can better judge the justice of an action than the rightness of a specific piece of legislation. The public is also better able to judge general policy than specific means of enforcement. It can react to goals more than means. Finally, the public is better at evaluating mistakes than at proposing solutions.

8. In general, the public will go along with an established fact. Controversy is apt to die out once action has been taken.

B. The Control of Public Opinion

1. Public opinion is a group process and subject to group pressures.[8] Group membership largely determines what an individual will see or hear, what he will believe and how he will act.[9] Events and issues are usually interpreted in line with group interests and beliefs.

2. This form of group pressure represents the social control of public opinion. The group strongly influences the "norms" of social conformity[10] and the "referents" whose approval the individual is seeking.[11]

3. Different groups will have varying amounts of influence upon the individual's opinions and behavior.[12] The individual will usually not conceive of such control as "coercive."[13]

4. The individual responds to group pressure in several ways: a) He follows suggestions from other members and leaders; b) He imitates others so as to conform to what the group consensus seems to be; c) He responds to criticism, chiding, or other negative reactions.

5. Group pressure will be more effective in bringing conformity to an issue, the more: a) the issue has strong salience for the group; b) the group is highly cohesive; c) prestige and status

accrue from "outstanding" conformity; d) leaders of the group actively encourage conformity; e) the group is alienated from other groups with an opposing stand on the issue.

6. Leaders in a group follow the group more often than they lead it. Leadership expresses or defines, rather than forms, group opinion.[14]

7. Group discussion generally serves the function of clarifying opinion rather than changing opinion. Clarification is followed by reinforcement because members repeat the group's opinion themselves and hear others repeat it.

C. *Conflict and Public Opinion*

1. In a society composed of highly differentiated subgroups, all of which are at times opposed by other groups, conflict is a natural and inevitable phenomenon. Minimum conditions for conflict include: a) contact; b) visibility; and c) competition.[15]

2. Group conflict arises in part because it satisfies certain individual or group needs. Competition for power and the frustration of individual wants make some form of conflict inevitable.[16]

3. The incidence and intensity of conflict accompanying social change vary according to: a) The extent or scope of the change;[17] b) Whether the change occurs suddenly or gradually; c) Whether the implementers of change work through public opinion or circumvent public opinion; d) Whether the implementers of change work within existing institutions or work from outside existing institutions.[18]

4. The following social conditions favor the growth of conflict: a) Persistent frustration of the goals, desires, needs or plans of large numbers of individuals;[19] b) Conflicting and mutually incompatible desires held by different groups in the society; c) Confusion and uncertainty about the present and the future.

5. In times of stress when individual members of society are afflicted with fear, anxiety, or insecurity, the groups they identify with become: a) More aggressive against opposing ideas; b) More emotional and less willing to evaluate facts; c) Less stable and resistant to change; d) More ready for a demogogic form of leadership.

6. Conflict is heightened by the formation and clear identification of opposing interests. Group goals become substituted for individual needs. Individual differences are forgotten and group solidarity increased. Individuals combine forces with the following consequences: a) The growth of a sense of identification in an im-

portant common undertaking; b) The desire for mutual sympathy, empathy and responsibility; c) The formulation of shared goals whose fulfillment requires cooperation; d) Inspiration and support by the individual members of the group.[20]

7. Conflict highlights the disintegrative forces in a society and promotes an identification of opposing interests. It brings issues out into the open, forces the taking of sides, unites and closes ranks and prepares the way for the resolution of the conflict through social change.[21]

8. Agitation characterizes the early stages of conflict (and may prove embarrassing when the conflict becomes respectable). Agitation serves to arouse people, make them excited, restless and discontented.

9. The threat of violence occurs much more frequently than actual violence. Conflict is more often resolved through a redefinition of the situation than violence.[22]

10. Most mob violence occurs through spontaneous mass behavior, having the following characteristics: a) Irrational action; collective action toward some objective, not open to debate; b) Sudden action; the explosion of a crowd in a highly aggressive state; c) Short-run action; the explosiveness of the crowd is unstable and disappears once the action takes place.

11. The following mechanisms are characteristic of mob violence: a) Circular reaction; b) Growing uneasiness or excitement; c) Restlessness or "milling"; d) Contagion; e) High suggestibility.

12. A frequent accompaniment to conflict and violence is *rumor*. The following conditions are conducive to the spread of rumors: a) The presence of a threat that arouses or reinforces feelings of insecurity; b) The collection of people in a common, geographical environment where they are in close communication; c) A common pattern of wishes or fears concerning the threat; d) Restricted or incomplete information which might lead people to suggest answers to questions for which the facts are absent.

13. As rumors spread they exhibit the following changes: a) Leveling; they grow shorter; b) Sharpening; realism is added through substitution of more believable reports; c) Assimilation; rumor is fitted into existing beliefs; d) Variation; they take on a number of different versions.

14. Rumors tend to create counter-rumors so that once started they fly thick and fast. Repeating a rumor in order to deny it is more apt to spread than impede it. Correct information given without the actual repetition of the rumor tends to halt the rumor.[23]

D. *Changing Public Opinion*

1. Public opinion is more affected by the redefinition of an issue or situation than by the changing of individual attitudes.[24]

2. Changes of opinion are largely in the direction of increased conformity or stability. The individual will tend to shift his position to conform to the groups to which he belongs or else he will modify his group allegiances so they do not seriously threaten his position.[25]

3. Working with specific groups rather than the general public is more effective in changing attitudes and behavior. Group standards can be developed and an individual taking part in this interaction will be more affected than if he is reached in isolation.[26]

4. Legislation may act as an effective means of changing public opinion because:[27] a) Legislation is educative—the passage and enforcement of legislation can inform the public about changes in public policy and convey to them many facts about the issue; b) Debate concerning legislation serves to arouse controversy and to organize public opinion on both sides of an issue; c) Most people will obey legislation that is properly enforced and will tend to bring their ideas into consistent relationship to their obedient action.

E. *Propaganda*

1. Modern mass society is characterized by constant attempts to manipulate and control public opinion. The most common form of attack is through propaganda, which may be defined as the deliberate attempt to influence opinions or behavior to some predetermined end.[28]

2. Propaganda is injected into an ongoing situation. This means that it becomes *part* of a major social process. While it may hasten or retard the process, rarely can it successfully oppose or advance the process in conflict with more basic social factors.[29]

3. Propaganda becomes a part of the total situation, e.g., propaganda consists not simply of the stimulus but of the stimulus presented to a group with particular social and psychological characteristics, at a specified moment in time, and in competition or cooperation with other propaganda and channels of communication.[30]

4. Very rarely will propaganda have an isolated effect. Changes will always induce other changes in the individual or the group. Most important to remember are the inevitable boomerang effects.[31]

5. Propaganda introduced within a group context is more effective than propaganda which has the single individual as its target.[32]

6. Propaganda is often aimed indiscriminately at masses of

individuals. The more focused the propaganda can be on "power" individuals, such as civic officials, "gatekeepers," opinion leaders, organizational leaders, etc., the more effective it will be. Psychological deafness or self-selectivity of information leads to selective exposure and interpretation.[33]

7. Strategies or approaches directed toward changing opinion or behavior may be classified as: a) direct attempts at changing values through education or exhortation; or b) indirect attempts to influence the situation through contact and participation or through conflict, involving negotiation and contention.[34]

8. Education, or the presentation of information, is relatively ineffective in changing opinions or behavior. The perception and interpretation of "facts" is self-selective and the individual can "protect" himself against facts he does not wish to believe.[35]

9. Major changes in individual prejudices seem to occur more quickly and thoroughly from exposure to social interaction in a new social environment than from information or exhortation.[36]

10. Propaganda is generally more effective if it: a) Avoids negative arguments; b) Attacks, rather than defends; c) Relates to existing social attitudes and cultural themes; d) Is credible, but not necessarily completely accurate; e) Transforms momentary conscious approval into conviction by repetition; f) Gets subjects to reinforce attitudes by behavior.[37]

Implications for Desegregation

Desegregation at first will probably be overwhelmingly opposed by the general public. It therefore will have to be accomplished without the support of public opinion. The extent to which it gradually becomes taken for granted as inevitable will be a significant indicator of the likelihood of success or failure. The proponents of desegregation will encounter difficulty in organizing grass-roots support. Such difficulty may even extend to "social" censorship of open debate or discussion of the problem. In most communities, support from existing organized groups will probably, at first, be weak, under-cover and limited to peripheral leadership.

Characteristics of Public Opinion

The general public will have only limited knowledge of the details of desegregation. Furthermore, they will not generally accumulate such knowledge. This will make it difficult to reach the general public with facts or logical arguments.

Nature and Incidence of Conflict

Desegregation, presenting as it does the highly conflicting interests of two major groups in our population, is bound to produce tension and conflict. The initial stages of desegregation will be stressful, characterized by fear, anxiety and insecurity. One may expect aggression against the supporters of desegregation, an unwillingness to look at the situation objectively, and a receptivity to demagogic leadership. Such evidences of resistance to a social change which is inconsistent with existing custom is both natural and inevitable. However, tension and conflict about desegregation will serve an important function in preparing the way for change by bringing the issue of desegregation into the open, identifying opposing interests, uniting support and, in general, disrupting the existing order so that a new definition of the situation becomes possible.

Conflict may be only slightly related to level of prejudice. While individual prejudice may predispose an individual toward conflict, such conflict will rarely take place unless community forces define such conflict as "acceptable."

Factors increasing the likelihood of conflict over desegregation include: 1. High "visibility" of the Negro, and vulnerability; 2. Increased competitiveness for available school facilities; 3. Increased contact between whites and Negroes; 4. Increased uncertainty and the disruption of stable expectations of intergroup conduct.

The more quickly, and firmly, specific patterns of desegregation are established, the sooner will these patterns be accepted as "appropriate," and the less likely is conflict to result. Such patterns will be more acceptable, the more they fit into existing local school practices and the less they are imposed from non-local sources. Personal deprivations of many southern whites will continue to create deflected aggression against the Negroes, regardless of the patterns of desegregation.

Conflict over desegregation will be minimized: 1. The more clearly, legal procedures evolve for protecting the rights of minorities; 2. The more effective, well-disciplined and impartial are the law-enforcement agencies prepared to back desegregation and the more there is public expectation that such authority will act in the case of violence; 3. The more that aggressive intergroup impulses are deflected into harmless channels; 4. The more that appeals are made to the American Creed of equality as supporting desegregation; 5. The more there is public commendation and prestigeful support for successful desegregation; 6. The more that appeals are made to local pride for achieving successful desegregation.

Conflict will be furthered by confusion and uncertainty about the modes of desegregation and the final outcome. Conflict over desegregation will probably pass through several stages. At first, this conflict will be vague, random and unstructured. There will be an uneasiness in the atmosphere. This uneasiness will gradually become focused and organized. It will take on definite form and follow specific strategy and tactics. Finally, the conflict will take its part as part of the larger organized conflict between Negroes and whites. Agitation is most likely to occur during the initial stages of planning desegregation. Such agitation will feed the restlessness and discontent of the public. As conflict over desegregation increases, we may expect the formation and clear identification of opposing interests. At this stage, the conflict will be largely between formal groups rather than one of public or mass behavior.

The threat of violence following desegregation will be followed only on rare occasions by actual violence. Where violence does occur it will resemble mob behavior, coming irrationally and suddenly. Its course will usually be quick and temporary.

Desegregation will be accompanied by the rapid spread of rumors. All of the conditions conducive to rumor will be present: 1. Desegregation poses a serious threat to existing southern customs; 2. The threat is localized in a common environment; 3. Public opinion is strongly opposed; 4. Factual information is difficult to secure.

Changing Public Opinion

Individual attitudes toward desegregation will change only as the problem becomes redefined as less threatening than originally conceived. Such redefinition is more likely to occur through the acceptance of actual events leading to desegregation than through argumentation. As a group becomes more or less favorable toward desegregation, the individual members will shift his own opinions or will shift his allegiance to groups more in accord with his opinions. In general, he is more likely to go along with the group than to leave it.

Attitudes and behavior toward desegregation can be more effectively changed by working with groups rather than single individuals. It is easier to reach groups than individuals, and group change, once initiated, tends to become unanimous. Group opinion strongly reinforces and crystallizes individual opinion.

Propaganda

Desegregation is a community process, and propaganda about desegregation must be recognized as only one factor affecting the process. Information and education about desegregation will come from many different sources and any specific set of materials must be viewed as only one small part of the entire communication process. It is doubtful that propaganda alone can greatly change the outcome of desegregation. It may, to some extent, hasten or retard the processes leading up to desegregation, but it will not be the major factor responsible for it. Propaganda should be viewed in terms of the total community situation into which it is injected; not simply as a major stimulus in itself, but rather as one stimulus to be combined with many other stimuli by particular groups supporting desegregation at a specified time.

Basic strategies for securing support for desegregation include:

Education—the public can be informed of the relative advantages of a desegregated school system. While such information will rarely change an individual's attitude, it will reinforce those who are already favorable. When ethically and practically feasible, such information should not seem to attack groups or individuals with opposing opinion. If possible, key individuals should actively participate in gathering relevant information about desegregation.

Exhortation—under some circumstances, effective use can be made of the "American Creed" in eliciting support for desegregation. Appeals to conscience or ethics can be used to reinforce those who tend to be favorable but these same appeals may actually create feelings of guilt and hostility among those who are unfavorable. Care must be taken not to permit such "preaching" to substitute for constructive action.

Negotiation—a great deal of desegregation will probably have to be accomplished through mediation and compromise. Such negotiation can be quite effective provided appeasement does not become substituted for progress.

Participation—desegregation should offer many new opportunities for participation of Negroes and whites in joint activities. Such participation will do much toward imparting new attitudes and behavior.

Contention—a firm policy of support for desegregation, with an expressed willingness to "fight" if necessary, can offer an effective challenge to the evasion of desegregation.

In using propaganda, it is particularly important to be sensitive to "boomerang" possibilities. For example, "race" propaganda is apt to have the following boomerang possibilities: 1. Nativistic reactions—increased in-group awareness of differences; 2. Defensive hostility—increased feelings of threat; 3. Defensive solidarity—increased out-group aggression; 4. Verbalization of previously inarticulated prejudices; 5. Reinforcement (by revealing the extent of the existing problem); 6. Aroused guilt which may be expressed in hostility.

1. Lowell distinguishes between the numerical majority and the effective majority representing those individuals prepared to defend their opinions. A. Lawrence Lowell, *Public Opinion and Popular Government* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1926), p. 14.
2. "Public opinion is no mere aggregate of separate individual judgments, but an organization, a cooperative product of communication and reciprocal influence." C. Cooley, *Social Organization* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 121.
3. Floyd H. Allport, "Toward a Science of Public Opinion," *Public Opinion Quarterly* (1937), 1, pp. 7-23.
4. "...There is no public opinion where there is no substantial agreement. But there is no public opinion where there is not agreement." R. Park, and E. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924), p. 832.
5. For a full discussion of the mores, see W. Summer, *Folkways* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1906), Ch. 2; E. Faris, *The Nature of Human Nature* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937), Ch. 19.
6. "An opinion, a belief, an attitude is 'correct,' 'valid,' and 'proper' to the extent that it is anchored in a group of people with similar beliefs, opinions, and attitudes." D. Cartwright and A. Zander, *Group Dynamics* (Evanston: Row, Peterson & Co., 1953), p. 192.
7. "*...about a half of all prejudiced attitudes are based only on the need to conform to custom, to let well enough alone, to maintain the cultural pattern.*" G. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1954), p. 286.
8. Sherif and Cantril point out that the judgments, perceptions, and attitudes of the individual are dependent upon the group. Muzafer Sherif, and Hadley Cantril, *The Psychology of Ego-Involvements* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1947).
9. "It seems clear, then, *that similar behavior, attitudes, and opinions occur among the members of any enduring groups.* What may be the *causes* of these similarities? At least three explanations seem plausible: (a) Membership in a group determines for an individual many *of the things he will learn, see, do, think about, and so on....* (b) An indvidual may act like others in the group because they are *attractive* to him and he wants to be like them. (c) A person may behave in a manner similar to the rest of the group because he *fears punishment, ridicule,* or rejection by the members unless he does act as they do." Cartwright and Zander, *op. cit.*, p. 139.
10. "The process by which conformity is achieved we call social control

if we are thinking of compliance with norms, or authority if we are thinking of obedience to orders." George C. Homans, *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace Co., 1950), p. 281.

11. "If a person's attitudes are influenced by a set of norms which he assumes that he shares with other individuals, those individuals constitute for him a reference group." Theodore M. Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (New York: Dryden Press, 1950), p. 225.
12. "The strength of the force to conform is determined by the strength of the attraction which the group holds for the member, the importance of the issue on which conformity is being demanded, the awareness that the group's standard is unanimously supported by others, and the size of the group supporting the standard." Cartwright, and Zander, *op. cit.*, p. 141.
13. "When a person becomes identified with a set of symbols—groups, ideology, values, persons—and acts in its name, whatever happens to the set of symbols happens also to him, for it is a significant part of his personality structure." Walter Coutu, *Emergent Human Nature* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), p. 188.
14. "...the leader, like everyone else in the group, is subject to regulation by the group," (p. 44); "Clearly, the limits of the leadership role are set by the established social *norms* of the group, (p. 45). Muzafer Sherif, and Carolyn W. Sherif, *Groups in Harmony and Tension* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953).
15. "Group antagonisms seem to be inevitable when two peoples in contact with each other may be distinguished by differentiating characteristics, either inborn or cultural, and are actual or potential competitors." Donald Young, *American Minority Peoples* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1932), p. 586.
16. "In complex civilization, therefore, group antagonism necessarily increases because every differentiation brings about particularistic interests." Franz Alexander, Discussion of "Hostility and Fear in Social Life" by John Dollard, *Social Forces,* 17 (1938), p. 28.
17. "...aggressive intergroup behavior on the part of the majority group people appears most often to be a *reaction* to a threatening change in status or relationships considered to be normal." Robin M. Williams, Jr., "Review and Assessment of Research on Race and Culture Conflict," *Paper presented to the Conference on Research in Human Relations* (Rockefeller Foundation, February 27-March 1, 1953), p. 28.
18. Intergroup conflict is the more likely: (a) the greater the differentiation of groups and of individual social roles in a society; (b) the more rapid and far-reaching the social changes to which individuals have to adjust; (c) the more direct the intergroup competition for the distributive rewards of wealth, power, prestige, or other scarce values, and the more *successful* the competition of vulnerable groups; (d) the greater the general level of tension in the society as a result of economic depression, prior cultural conflict, or various types of social disorganization; (e) the greater the disruption of stable expectations of inter-personal conduct; (f) the smaller the number and adequacy of "harmless" outlets for aggression within

a society; (g) the larger the ratio of an "in-migrating" minority to the resident population and the more rapid the influx; (h) the more rapid the change in levels of living. Cf. Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (SSRC Bulletin 57, 1947), pp. 56-58.

19. John Dollard, and others, *Frustration and Aggression* (New Haven: Yale Universty Press, 1937); "...anxiety is generated by a repressed hostility and... it in turn again generates hostility." K. Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1937), p. 89.
20. L. Festinger, S. Schachter, and K. Back, *Social Pressures in Informal Groups* (New York: Harper, 1950); S. Schachter, "Deviation, Rejection and Communication," *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.* (1951), 46, pp. 190-208.
21. "...conflict, and particularly cultural conflict, insofar as it brings into the light of understanding impulses and attitudes of which we would otherwise remain unconscious, inevitably increases our knowledge not merely of ourselves but of our fellows." Robert E. Park, *Race and Culture* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950), p. 50.
22. "Mass violence (e.g., race riots) is most likely under the following conditions: (a) prolonged frustration, leading to a high tension level; (b) presence of population elements with a propensity to violence (especially lower class, adolescent males in socially disorganized areas); (c) a highly visible and rapid change in intergroup relations; (d) a precipitating incident of intergroup conflict." Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (SSRC Bulletin 57, 1947), p. 60.
23. "*In crisis situations* (pre-riot, etc.), refutation of rumors of hostile intentions of opposing groups, weakness of control forces, and the like tends to check conflict." *Ibid.*, p. 68.
24. "Re-education influences conduct only when the new system of values and beliefs dominates the individual's perception. The acceptance of the new system is linked with the acceptance of a specific group, a particular role, a definite source of authority as points of reference." K. Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts* (New York: Harper, 1948), p. 68.
25. K. Lewin, and P. Grabbe, "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values," *Journal of Social Issues*, 1(3):53-64 (1945).
26. "It has been assumed by some that the public commitment to carry through the behavior decided upon by the group creates an awareness of the expectations that the members had for each other, thus creating forces on each member to comply with these widely felt sentiments. These pressures for uniformity thus serve to develop a group standard." Cartwright and Zander, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
27. "Laws do establish criteria by which actions can be judged... a frame of reference within which other necessary processes can be systematized and accelerated." John H. Burma, "Race Relations and Anti-Discriminatory Legislation," *Amer. J. Soc.*, 56, (1951), p. 423; Kenesaw M. Landis, *Segregation in Washington* (National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capitol, Chicago, 1948).

28. *Propaganda—How to Recognize It and Deal With It* (New York: Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., 1938), p. 31. Other definitions stress the importance of concealment, self-interest, the use of verbal symbols, etc. See H. Lasswell, *Propaganda Techniques in the World War* (New York: Peter Smith, 1938), p. 8 ff.; G. Catlin, "Propaganda and Democratic Government," in H. Childs, (ed.), *Propaganda and Dictatorship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1936), pp. 127-128.
29. Locke stresses the need for a favorable situation to precede actual propaganda. H. Locke, "Changing Attitudes Toward Venereal Diseases," *American Sociological Review* (December, 1939), p. 843 ff.
30. S. H. Flowerman, "Mass Propaganda in the War against Bigotry," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 42:429-439 (1947); R. Merton, *Mass Persuasion* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1946).
31. S. H. Flowerman, "The Use of Propaganda to Reduce Prejudice: A Refutation," *Internat. J. Opin. & Attit. Res.* (1949), 3, pp. 99-108; P. F. Lazarsfeld, "Some Remarks on the Role of the Mass Media in So-Called Tolerance Propaganda," *J. Soc. Issues* (1947), 3, pp. 17-25.
32. T. Newcomb, "Social Psychology and Group Processes," in Calvin P. Stone, and Donald W. Taylor (eds.) *Annual Review of Psychology* (Annual Reviews, Inc., Stanford, 1953), pp. 183-214. Eight generalizations are given for changing people through groups in D. Cartwright, "Achieving Change in People: Some Applications of Group Dynamics Theory," *Human Relations,* (1951), 4, pp. 381-392.
33. For example, J. D. Lohman, *The Police and Minority Groups* (Chicago: Chicago Park District, 1947).
34. Goodwin Watson has classified these activities into six patterns: exhortation, education, participation, revelation, negotiation, and prevention. G. Watson, *Action for Unity* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1946).
35. There are a great many studies pointing to the ineffectiveness of the educational approach. For example, R. K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), "The appeal to 'education' as cure-all for the most varied social problems is rooted deep in the mores of America. Yet it is nonetheless illusory for all that. Education may serve as an operational adjunct but not as the chief basis for any but excruciatingly slow change in the prevailing patterns of race relations."; R. M. MacIver, *The More Perfect Union* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948), pp. 222-223, "All we can claim for instruction of a purely factual kind is that it tends to mitigate some of the more extreme expressions of prejudice..."; K. Lewin, *op. cit.,* p. 63, "Re-education is frequently in danger of reaching only the official system of values, the level of verbal expression and not of conduct..."
36. See, for example, the many studies stressing the importance of contact and participation in reducing prejudice. M. Deutsch, and M. E. Collins, *Interracial Housing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951); S. Stouffer, *et. al., The American Soldier* (Princeton:

Princeton University Press, 1949), Vol. I, Chapter 10; D. Wilner, Rosabelle P. Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook, "Residential Proximity and Intergroup Relations in Public Housing Projects," *J. Soc. Issues*, 8, (1952), pp. 45-69.

37. The literature on propaganda is replete with rules of thumb on the techniques of propaganda. These are much too numerous to summarize here. See, for example, O. Klineberg, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding* (SSRC Bulletin 62, 1950), pp. 154-163; Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, pp. 31-32, 64-65. Excellent theoretical analyses, including the listing of hypotheses on opinion change may be found in Kurt Lewin and P. Grabbe, "Conduct, Knowledge, and Acceptance of New Values," *Journal of Social Issues*, 1(3):53-64 (1945) and Jeanne Watson, "Some Social and Psychological Situations Related to Change in Attitude," *Human Relations*, 3, (1950), pp. 15-56.

CHAPTER 4.

Interaction and Communication

The field of intergroup relations is becoming more and more concerned with the specific interaction that occurs between members of different social, religious, and ethnic groups. Intergroup relations, after all, does involve the coming together of ***both majority and minority*** group members in ***specific situations*** which require them ***to react to each other's presence*** and ***to communicate thoughts and feelings.*** For an understanding of the social psychology of intergroup contact, it is important to learn how these interacting groups are formed, the course of such interaction, and the final outcome. Desegregation, involving as it does the mixing of Negroes and whites, is directly concerned with this process of interaction.

A. The Nature of Interaction

1. The contacts between members of different groups serve to define the kind of social relationships that exist among the various groups in a society. An understanding of intergroup relations involves an awareness of the patterns of interaction that exist between members of different groups. Such patterns are characterized by organization, recurrence and continuity.[1]

2. Interaction to a large extent determines the group identifications and attitudes of the individual. It serves to define the group "norms" to which he will adhere and the "referents" that will serve as his models of behavior.[2]

3. The following social-psychological mechanisms tend to characterize interaction between minority and majority groups: a) The "***defensive insulation***" of minority groups which leads them to retreat from further contact opportunities following rebuff and unpleasant intergroup experiences;[3] b) The "***associational inbreeding***" of majority and minority members—group pressures toward in-group conformity and out-group alienation lead to patterns of avoidance;[4] c) "***Protective selection***" which limits minority group members to those contact opportunities which contain a minimum of threat of conflict and rebuff;[5] d) "***Refracted perceptions***" which distort the awareness of majority and minority members of each other's presence. This may lead to either a lack of consciousness

or to supersensitivity of the other group's presence;[6] e) *"Self-hate"* of minority individuals which lowers self-confidence and creates feelings of inadequacy leading to the avoidance of contact opportunities.[7]

B. Determinants of Interaction

1. The more opportunities for intergroup interaction there are, the more interaction actually occurs, under the conditions indicated in the studies cited below.[8]

2. Status and role memberships, such as sex, age, SES, occupation, etc., are probably among the most important *social factors* determining whether or not an individual's social environment will include members of an out-group. These group memberships tend to determine the "beaten paths" pursued by the individual in his community life. These memberships also set standards of approval on intergroup interaction. *Personality factors* and *intergroup attitudes* on the other hand are relatively unimportant in determining *exposure* to intergroup interaction.

3. Social patterns of appropriate interaction appear to determine much intergroup behavior. Community practices serve to set the broad limits of "acceptable and appropriate" opportunities for intergroup contact. The amount of opportunity for intergroup contact will vary from community to community depending on the many "operating practices" for intergroup behavior that arise in all communities.[9]

4. Individual prejudice is only slightly related to the discriminatory behavior of an individual in these socially-defined situations.[10]

C. Effects of Interaction

1. Interaction between Negroes and whites in situations of social contact studied thus far is usually accompanied and followed by some overall reduction in prejudice. Interaction produces identification and increased understanding or empathy.[11]

2. The extent to which an intergroup contact-opportunity will result in social interaction and friendship formation will depend upon: a) characteristics of the participants; b) external pressures upon social interaction in the situation; c) factors initiating or producing the interaction; and d) the nature of the contact situation itself.[12]

3. *Characteristics of the participants*—The more the participants in an intergroup situation possess the following characteristics, the more likely is it that friendships will result:[13]

a) Similar status and role positions.

b) Positive or favorable anticipatory "definitions of the situation." A positive set toward social interaction includes such factors as: 1) low level of prejudice; 2) high acceptance of democratic values; 3) intergroup social sophistication; 4) favorable expectation; 5) high motivation; 6) pleasant previous experience.[14]

c) Adjusted and adaptive personality structure—This includes such factors as strong feelings of personal security, sociability, etc.[15]

4. *External pressures*—The more the individual is subjected to reinforcing stimuli from outside sources, the more likely he is to form intergroup friendships. Such pressures include: a) Unprejudiced or approving reference groups; b) Positive "vicarious" or mass media support; c) Favorable institutional support from such sources as church, school, and family.

5. *Factors producing the contact situation*—Among the more important of these initiating factors are: a) The purpose or goal of the situation;[16] b) The naturalness of the situation;[17] c) Sponsorship or "pressures" supporting the situation.

6. *Nature of the contact situation*—Different situations contain varying possibilities of friendship formation. Determining factors include:

a) Type of activity—Some situations, such as the neighborhood, call for or permit a greater degree of social interaction than others such as marketing.[18]

b) Conditioning factors—Some of the more important of these conditioning factors are: 1) *duration of situation;* 2) *intimacy of situation;*[19] 3) *competitiveness;* 4) *conflict or tension;*[20] 5) *repetitiveness of situation;* 6) *necessity for mutual activity.*[21]

c) Sociometric structure—The type of leadership in a group, the kind of clique structure that develops (especially along ethnic lines), the relative status and role structure of the participants, will affect the kind of interaction that takes place.

7. Interaction may result in the "exemption" of particular out-group individuals from the stereotypic picture of the entire out-group. Such "exemption" permits an individual to interact with individuals belonging to a group toward which he is prejudiced without changing his attitude toward the group as a whole.[22]

8. There is little transfer or carry-over from one interactional situation to another. Although an individual accepts interaction in one situation as appropriate, usually it gives little indication of his feelings or behavior about interaction in another situation.[23]

D. *Communication and Interaction*

1. For intergroup contact to result in reduced hostility and increased mutual understanding, communication across group lines must occur. The different cultural background and experiences of Negroes and whites make it difficult for these groups to communicate with each other and when communication takes place, these different experiences are apt to make understanding difficult.

2. Freedom to communicate does not guarantee communication. Unless communication in the intergroup situation is defined as appropriate, communication will be minimal. Whether communication across group lines takes place or not depends more upon the demands of the specific situation than upon the attitudes of prejudice of the participants in the situation.

3. Reduced communication leads to a growth of stereotypes and negative expectations on both sides; these become expressions of group expectations of continued out-group hostility, and mean further reduction in communication (the "vicious circle").

4. Most Negro-white communication is strongly functional, e.g., it takes place in answer to a specific need rather than a general desire for association. It usually serves a definite purpose and rarely centers about a general exchange of ideas.

5. Many barriers to intergroup communication are covert, e.g., they are not deliberately set up or easily observable; a) Anticipation of "trouble" interferes with communication; b) The pattern of avoiding controversial intergroup subjects, such as inter-marriage, deters communication for both Negroes and whites; c) Fear of censure by members of the individual's own group tends to inhibit communication for both Negroes and whites; d) Negroes are often deterred from communicating with whites by such factors as:

1) Fear of doing or saying something that will seem to reinforce white stereotypes of Negroes.

2) Fear that a white person's basic motive in any intergroup situation is to exploit the Negroes in the situation.

3) Generalized anticipation that all white people are prejudiced.

4) Realistic fear of violence.

6. Barriers to intergroup communication tend to be self-perpetuating: e.g., an interference with communication leads to withdrawal, which in turn, creates more barriers; barriers prevent corrective communication, and perpetuates insulation.

7. A major barrier to intergroup communication is what may be termed "the language of prejudice." The language of prejudice may be defined as those words and phrases in the cultural milieu of a given group which when used accidentally or intentionally, directly or indirectly, convey to members of another ethnic group contempt, derision, stereotypic assumptions, or, at least, an awareness of ethnic differences. The cultural milieu of most whites contains a considerable "language of prejudice" directed toward Negroes because of the anti-Negro aspects of American culture that are unreflectively absorbed by most American white people in the process of socialization.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DESEGREGATION

One of the most important consequences of desegregation will be the creation of new opportunities for contact between whites and Negroes in the South. This will obviously occur where white and Negro students share the same educational facilities. It will also be true for white and Negro school teachers working in the same schools. If Negroes and whites of the larger community come together for mutual cooperation toward desegregation, desegregation will also result in greater opportunities for interaction in the larger community. Although the extent is unknown and probably minor, opportunities for intergroup contact as a result of desegregation may extend into other areas of community life.

Desegregation will probably result in a decrease of the "defensive insulation" of the Negro group since acceptance in school will be supportive to the Negro's feelings of being acceptable in other contact situations. On the other hand, by "protective selection" Negro students will form friends primarily with the less prejudiced white students. It is likely that, at the beginning, "associational inbreeding" will cut down intergroup contacts and lead to a heightened sensitivity to each other's presence. "Self-hate" among the Negroes should also show a decrease.

The Negro in a desegregated school will be faced with a problem of adjusting his behavior to his new set of norms. In an all-Negro school, Negroes could have their own set of norms, but in a desegregated school behavior of Negro children will be judged according to majority group norms. It desegregation takes place in an atmosphere of anticipating conflict, such conflict is more likely to occur. Expectations can distort reality, and conflict may be based on these misperceptions rather than on the real situation.

Effects of Interaction

In general, where desegregation does occur it is likely to result in increased friendship formation and some modification of prejudicial attitudes. Contact within the school situation will carry over into interaction outside the school only infrequently. The amount of transfer that occurs within the school situation will depend upon the extent to which desegregation includes extra-curricular activities.

Interaction is more likely to occur between Negro and white students occupying similar status and role positions. The more the students approach the situation with favorable expectations, the more likely it is that the situation will be successful in promoting interaction. Such favorable anticipatory definitions depend upon a relatively low level of prejudice, a high acceptance of democratic values, previous pleasant intergroup relations experience, and favorable motivation. Well-adjusted individuals are more likely to interact than authoritarian, maladjusted individuals.

Unprejudiced or approving referent groups, favorable support from such institutions as the church, and approval from the community and the mass media of communication will be conducive to intergroup friendship formation within the school situation and the community at large.

School situations in which the focus of interaction is upon a common interest, goal, or task, rather than upon the intergroup situation as such, will be more effective in promoting friendly interaction. Personal association of students, teachers, parents and community leaders as functioning equals, working together on the common task of desegregation, is more likely to result in friendly interaction.

Friendship formation is most likely to occur in school situations requiring social interaction. Within an interaction situation, friendship formation will be more likely to occur the longer the situation continues, the more often it is repeated, the more intimate it is, the less competition that is involved, the more relaxed the atmosphere, and the more need there is for mutual activity. A democratic leadership is more likely to result in friendship formation than authoritarian leadership. The formation of social cliques will inhibit intergroup interaction. The more that non-class activities are divided according to race, the more the Negro and white students will tend to set up "voluntary" segregated groups. Such voluntary segregation will increase in-group ethnocentrism and out-group antagonism.

Intergroup Communication

Since school desegregation will directly affect young people, new patterns of intergroup communication will be established early in life. Such patterns may invalidate many of the avoidance techniques that develop from sources other than personal experience.

Desegregation will create new opportunities for communication that are defined as appropriate, and more communication will take place. Furthermore, the planning and execution of desegregation will necessitate greater communication between Negro and white adults. Desegregation, while increasing intergroup communication, may also increase the exchange of ideas about other concerns related to the Negro and white communities. Similarly, patterns of intergroup communication established during the desegregation process are likely to carry over to non-school situations.

Desegregation will probably decrease the public discussion of controversial intergroup subjects, but it may encourage increased private discussions in all-white or all-Negro groups. Public discussions of intergroup relations will generally create feelings of uneasiness among students. Such uneasiness will be increased insofar as students of one race feel they are being constantly judged by students of the other.

The "language of prejudice" is most apt to occur among individuals with little previous equal-status contact with Negroes. Incidents of friction will be bound to occur among Negroes and whites brought together in a setting of equality for the first time in the course of desegregation. White students especially will have to acquire a knowledge of terms which arouse resentment among Negro students. Undoubtedly many incidents of friction will be created through the misuse of language. But in the long run understanding will replace ignorance, and a basis for continuing relationships will be established. The more successful that school administrations are in finding a form of orientation to acquaint white teachers and students with the "language of prejudice" problems and to reassure Negro students of the "accidental" nature of much of the "language of prejudice," then, the more likely it is that Negro-white communication in non-segregated settings will become spontaneous and informal, rather than strained and uncomfortable.

---

1. As defined by Cook, "Contact is some form of behavioral interaction, usually involving communication." Stuart W. Cook, *Contact and Intergroup Relations* (Research Center for Human Relations, New York University, 1952), mimeographed, p. 8. Interaction refers to "the fact or process of reciprocal relations and influences

that obtain between and among the members of the group." Edward B. Reuter, *Handbook of Sociology* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1941), p. 130. Such interaction is the basis for all patterns of social relationship—"As persons interact, mutual expectations and concerns arise, and as interaction continues over time, more-or-less definite patterns emerge." Robin M. Williams, Jr., *American Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), p. 444.

2. "It follows that the term *intergroup relations* refers to the relations between two or more in-groups and their respective members. Whenever individuals belonging to one in-group, collectively or individually, interact with another group or its members in terms of their group identification, we have an instance of intergroup relations." Muzafer Sherif, and Carolyn W. Sherif, *Groups in Harmony and Tension* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953), p. 2.
3. "If any generalization can be made it might be to the effect that victims of prejudice learn to lead their lives under a condition of mild dissociation. So long as they can move freely and act naturally within their own in-group they manage to put up with (and discount) rebuffs received outside. And they grow habituated to this slight split in their mode of living." Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.), p. 158.
4. "But normally we may say that misery finds balm through the closer association of people who are miserable for the same reason. Threats drive them to seek protective unity within their common membership." *Ibid.*, p. 148.
5. "Passive acquiescence is sometimes the only way in which seriously threatened minority groups can survive." *Ibid.*, p. 147.
6. "Preoccupation with the problem may, of course, go to excessive lengths, so that every contact with members of the dominant group is viewed with deep suspicion. The result is a 'chip on the shoulder.'" *Ibid.*, p. 145.
7. K. Lewin, "Self-hatred among Jews," *Contemporary Jewish Record* (1941), 4, pp. 219-232.
8. Morton Deutsch, and Mary E. Collins, *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment*, Minneapolis: (University of Minnesota Press, 1951), and Leon Festinger, and H. H. Kelley, *Changing Attitudes through Social Contact*, (Research Center for Group Dynamics, Ann Arbor, 1954).
9. "We know that many persons who discriminate do so not out of their own prejudice but out of a tendency to conform to a discriminatory pattern they find in their communities or at their place of work . . ." M. Berger, "A Look at U.S. Race Relations" *The UNESCO Courier*, Vol. VII, No. 5, (Oct., 1954), p. 5.
10. "The attitude of an employer toward Negro workers appears to have very little to do with whether or not he employs them." H. A. Bullock, "Racial Attitudes and the Employment of Negroes," *American Journal of Sociology*, 45, (1951), pp. 448-457. See also, E. C. Hughes, "Knitting of Racial Groups in Industry," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, 11, (1946), pp. 512-519; Bernard Kutner, *et al.*, "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behavior Involving Racial Prejudice," *J. Abn. and Soc.*

Psych., 47, (1952), pp. 649-652; Joseph P. Lohman, and Dietrich C. Reitzes, "Note on Race Relations in Mass Society," *Amer. J. Soc.*, 58, (1952), pp. 240-247; Ralph D. Minard, "Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field," *J. Soc. Issues*, 8, (1952), pp. 29-44.

11. "We may hypothesize that at any level of liking or disliking or sense of social distance, persons with no social contact with members of a racial or cultural out-group will be more likely than those with contacts to endorse negative stereotypes of that particular out-group category or collectivity." Gerhart Saenger, and Samuel Flowerman, "Stereotypes and Prejudicial Attitudes," *Human Relations*, 7, (1954), pp. 233-34. "For those with similar values . . . social contact, because it is rewarding, will motivate them to seek further contact." M. Berger, Theodore Abel, and Charles H. Page (eds.), *Freedom and Control in Modern Society* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1954), p. 30. See also, Ira N. Brophy, "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," *Pub. Opinion Quarterly*, 9, (1945-46), pp. 456-466; Morton Deutsch, and Mary E. Collins, *op. cit.*; Barbara K. MacKenzie, "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes toward Negroes," *J. Abn. and Soc. Psych.*, 43, 1948, pp. 417-441; S. A. Stouffer, *et al.*, *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949). Vol. I, Chapter 10.
12. Allport, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-263 lists the following variables as most important: quantitative aspects, status aspects, role aspects, social atmosphere, personality, and area of contact.
13. "Conversely, contact between members of groups holding very different economic and social status (or between members of groups equally deprived of status, e.g., the poor whites and poor blacks) intensifies rivalry and the desire to establish status at the expense of one another." Gordon W. Allport, and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology*, 22:9-39 (1946), p. 23.
14. Barbara K. MacKenzie, "The importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes Toward Negroes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (1948), 43, pp. 417-441.
15. P. H. Mussen, "Some Personality and Social Factors Related to Changes in Children's Attitudes Toward Negroes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, (1951), 45, pp. 423-441.
16. "Personal association of members of different groups is most effective in reducing hostility and increasing understanding when the focus of interaction is upon a common interest, goal, or task rather than upon intergroup association as such." Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*, (Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 57, 1947), p. 71.
17. "Lessened hostility will result from arranging intergroup collaboration, on the basis of personal association of individuals as functional equals, on a common task jointly accepted as worthwhile." *Ibid.*, p. 69.
18. ". . . it is easier to integrate the Negro or any other out-group into a secular institution characterized by casual and impersonal contacts that into a sacred institution based upon families and the

peculiar cultural traditions of the group." E. Franklin Frazier, "Race Contacts and the Social Structure," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, 14, (1949), pp. 1-11, p. 8.

19. "Positive changes tend to occur among individuals who have relatively intimate *contacts with Negroes and perceive these contacts as socially approved, and, as a result change in their attitudes.*" D. M. Wilner, R. P. Walkley, and S. W. Cook, "Residential Proximity and Intergroup Relations in Public Housing Projects." *J. Soc. Issues*, (1952), 8, pp. 45-69.
20. "Closeness of contact, or familiarity as such, between groups will not necessarily lead to a reduction in social distance between the individual members, unless it is accompanied by the discovery that there are elements shared in common." I. D. MacCrone, *Race Attitudes in South Africa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 178.
21. "When contact between members of socially distant out-groups involves joint participation as members in an in-group whose norms favor such participations, the individual's attitudes toward members of the out-group are likely to be altered." Muzafer Sherif, and Carolyn W. Sherif, *op. cit.*, p. 222.
22. "While friendly associations with an individual member of an out-group held at considerable distance may *become* important in changed attitudes toward the out-group, it is more likely that the out-group member in question will be considered simply as an *exceptional* member of the out-group, therefore not possessing the stereotyped traits attached to the out-group." *Ibid.*, p. 221.
23. Frank F. Lee, "The Race Relations Pattern of Areas of Behavior in A Small New England Town," *Amer. Soc. Rev.*, 19, (1954), pp. 138-143, and Joseph P. Lohman, and Dietrich C. Rietzes, "Note on Race Relations in Mass Society," *Amer. J. Soc.*, 58, (1952), pp. 240-247.

CHAPTER 5.

Prejudice and Personality

Typically, the primary concern of both social scientists and practitioners in the field of intergroup relations has been the phenomenon of intergroup prejudice. The propositions that follow represent a summary statement of important findings with respect to the general nature, origins and consequences of prejudice, and the specific relationship between prejudice and discrimination or segregation. With one or two exceptions, propositions dealing with the reduction and control of prejudice are not included here, since they appear in other sections of this monograph. (See especially, "Interaction," and "Propaganda.")

A. The Nature of Prejudice

1. Intergroup prejudice is a *social attitude* and, *like any attitude*, it can be segmentalized into more or less clearly differentiated *dimensions*. Intergroup attitudes differ from other attitudes only in the *object* toward which the attitude is directed. Every attitude has *content*, which may be divided into three major dimensions: (1) a cognitive orientation; (2) an effective orientation; and (3) a behavioral orientation.[1]

2. Objects of prejudice in our society may be identified according to: a) color; b) creed; c) cultural pattern; d) geographical region; e) nationality or national origin, including citizenship; f) occupation; g) political opinion; h) race; i) sex; j) social status.[2]

3. Prejudice is in part determined by: a) *Visibility* of groups; b) *Contact* of groups; c) *Competition* of groups; d) Differences in *values*, and behavior patterns considered as expressing values.[3]

4. In-group preference, accompanied by a tendency to prejudge or stereotype members of out-groups, is universal, existing in every kind of human society.[4]

5. Prejudice is *learned*, not innate, and may be learned at a very early age. Such prejudiced attitudes are learned chiefly from contact with others holding those attitudes, rather than from contact or experience with members of the prejudged group.[5]

6. Many of the different types of prejudice (stereotypes

about minorities, reactions to hypothetical situations, scapegoating, etc.) are disengaged—e.g., prejudices that are expressed without explicit reference to any specific real situation, and are learned by participating in a social environment where others have prejudices. Disengaged prejudices are acquired much as tastes in food, dress, or music are acquired—from others who have those tastes.[6]

7. For many people, prejudice against minority group members is a phenomenon of the specific contact situation, rather than a single attitude that manifests itself in all contact situations. The majority group member's response tends to vary less with his "basic" attitude of prejudice or non-prejudice, and more with his definition of the intergroup contact situation as appropriate or inappropriate.[7]

8. Stereotyped or hostile reactions to a minority group may not extend to all members of the minority group, but are qualified by a partial acceptance of certain members of the minority. The individual employs a mechanism whereby he *exempts* specific minority group persons from his stereotypes of the group as a whole. By defining these exempted persons as *atypical* of their group, he can maintain friendly relationships with them without having to revise his way of thinking about the entire group.

B. *Origins of Prejudice*

1. Six general types of prejudice may be distinguished from each other on the basis of implications as to their origins: a) prejudice based on conformity to the social customs of a group; b) prejudice anchored in deep aggressive needs in the personality; c) the prejudice of economic or political opportunism, often calculating and impersonal; d) the prejudice manifest in the fanaticism of the religious or cultural zealot; e) the prejudice manifest in a specific *idee fixe* concerning a *particular* group; f) prejudice expressive of generalized antipathy to *any* out-group.[8]

2. It is probable that prejudice based on conformity to the social customs of a group, is the most common in our own society and in others.[9]

3. Prejudiced reactions to members of an out-group may represent an aggressive response to various kinds of personal frustration.[10]

4. For some people, out-group prejudice appears to be a function of insecurity and the desire to build up one's self-esteem.[11]

5. Many highly prejudiced people manifest a number of personality characteristics of which generalized ethnocentric atti-

✓

tudes may be symptomatic.[12] The general findings indicate that prejudiced individuals tend to manifest: a) "conventionalized" social conformity with deep ambivalence toward social norms and the authorities enforcing them; b) a puritanical conscience; c) repressed hostility toward parents; d) admiration of power and strength; e) advocacy of severe punishment; f) status-anxiety; g) repressed sexuality; h) a rigidly dichotomous style of thinking; i) a tendency to distrust other people; j) a tendency to view the world as evil and dangerous.[13]

6. Prejudice reflects not only the frustrations and insecurities of *individuals* but also the self-interests of certain economic and political *groups* in our society.[14] Proponents of an extreme economic-deterministic view have argued that prejudice and intergroup conflict are merely one aspect of the class struggle. That the economic self-interest of power groups may motivate intergroup hostility in some situations seems clear.[15]

C. *Prejudice and Discrimination*

1. The problem of the relationship between prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory practices is one that has long concerned theorists and practitioners in intergroup relations. Do discriminatory practices follow directly from the prejudiced attitudes of discriminators, or can discriminatory patterns exist in relative independence of the level of prejudice of persons or groups that practice and perpetuate them?

2. Early "white supremacy" theorists believed that attitudes of whites toward Negroes caused discrimination, and that both the attitudes and the behavior were justified by biological facts. Although the sciences of biology and psychology have long since discredited this view, many white people continue to hold a modified version of it.[16]

3. Later theorists rejected the notion that Negroes are biologically or morally inferior. They believed, however, that these social attitudes toward Negroes are so deeply rooted in the "folkways and mores" that efforts to change either the attitudes *or their direct consequences* (discrimination and segregation) are pre-doomed to failure.[17]

4. More recent evidence suggests that: a) race prejudice is not inevitably fixed in the mores; and b) discrimination cannot be explained as simply the behavioral reflection of prejudiced attitudes; in fact, discrimination and its consequences may actually lie at the root of these attitudes and serve to perpetuate them.[18]

5. Prejudice can exist in the absence of discrimination, and vice versa.[19] Behavior and attitude appear to be two separate dimensions, with a certain degree of independence and mutual reinforcement.

6. In any given community or group, the processes that determine the appropriateness and acceptability of various intergroup contacts and patterns of interaction may be, in large part, different from, and independent of, the processes that determine the type and level of prejudice in an individual member of the community or group. For many majority group members, disengaged prejudices are articulated as attitudes or opinion, but may not motivate actual behavior in the interactive situation with minority group members. Despite the general level of disengaged prejudice, acceptance, even friendship formation, may take place within an interactive situation that is defined as appropriate, or as legitimized, by the existing authorities.[20]

7. Change in intergroup relations need not await a long period of re-education for prejudiced persons. It is, in fact, more likely that in most instances re-education in American Creed values *follows* rather than *precedes* changes in the patterns of interaction between minority and majority group members.[21]

IMPLICATIONS FOR DESEGREGATION

Where policy-makers on the national, state or community level have made the decision to desegregate, there is reason to believe that an orderly desegregation *can* take place, even though the majority of individuals articulate opposition to it. Because an individual holds prejudiced attitudes toward the out-group, it does not necessarily follow that he will refuse to cooperate in a non-segregated setting. Most individuals tend toward obedience of the law, even though their own beliefs run counter to the law's objectives. Where a policy of desegregation is firmly administered, people tend eventually to concede the legitimacy of the policy, while they may or may not abandon their personal prejudices against the out-group.

However, good intergroup relations do not come automatically with desegregation. What happens after whites and Negroes have been brought together in the schools is of crucial importance. It is then that the processes of *integration* get under way. Integration may be defined as the unlearning of prejudices and the establishing of democratic values through interaction in a non-segregated environment.

The effects of desegregation can perhaps best be viewed as having two distinguishable (but not distinct) phases. One, a "situational phase," comprises responses limited to the contact situation, i.e., the formation of friendships across racial lines *in the situation where the contact occurs.* Another, a "carry-over" phase, comprises responses that extend beyond the limits of the situations where the contact occurs, i.e., accepting minority friends formed in the contact situation in other more controversial situations; accepting other minority persons in these more controversial situations; giving up stereotypic misconceptions about minority persons in general; giving up antipathies toward minorities, and altering personal definitions of the appropriate limits of association with minorities.

Situational responses: Despite prejudices expressed by both majority and minority group members, non-segregated activities can operate without overt friction and can provide opportunities for close interracial contacts. When these contacts do occur, friendship formation may take place even though the level of prejudice seems fairly high. In general, friendship formation in specific intergroup contact situations is probably more related to the frequency and type of recurring contact opportunities and to the individual's friendliness-hostility set toward people in general than it is to the level of disengaged intergroup prejudice.

Carry-over responses: The processes of interaction and friendship formation seems, for most people, to stall in the situational phase. In area after area of social change in intergroup relations, the whole process of desegregation has had to occur anew. Even where there is friendly acceptance in the specific intergroup contact situation and, perhaps, even considerable friendship formation, carry-over to more controversial situations seems to take place only rarely.

Thus, the first effects of a desegregated enviroment on the participants can be expected to be situational. Full integration cannot be said to have been reached until situational responses have been carried over to other situations and incorporated into a value system based on the American Creed.

The propositions dealing with the deep-seated prejudice of so-called "authoritarian" or "rigid" personalities seem to have at least two major implications for desegregation of southern schools. The first is that in states or communities where such deeply prejudiced persons are in a position to make the decision for or against desegregation, progress toward genuine desegregation will not occur, unless: 1. such persons can be removed from their power positions; 2. public pressures are strong or articulate for desegregation; or 3. outside enforcement agencies exist that can impose sanctions on those who refuse to comply. The second, a longer-range implication, is that in schools that have desegregated, students whose prejudice is deeply rooted in personality needs will be most resistant to the corrective communication provided by the non-segregated environment. Such personality types are most likely to give articulate backing to ringleaders where interracial conflict does occur. But since such students will often be in the minority, they can usually be regarded as special behavior problems needing specialized attention or treatment, and not as students whose views and personality needs are shared by the majority of their fellow students.

Where desegregated school facilities become an accomplished fact, prejudice is likely to decrease most rapidly among those participants in the non-segregated environment whose prejudice has been based on conformity to the social customs of a group, and among those persons whose prejudice has been impersonal, based on an economic or political opportunism that the situation no longer demands. Prejudice can be expected to decrease least among persons for whom it satisfied deep aggressive needs in the personality (including "professional" or highly dedicated racial fanatics).

1. Cutting across these content dimensions are various other dimensions that Chein enumerates as follows: (a) Degree of uncertainty or conviction with regard to (1) and (2); intensity with regard to (3); (b) Degree of covertness or overtness; (c) Degree of consistency or inconsistency, or ambivalence; (d) Degree of salience of object in personal life space; (e) Consciousness—unconsciousness of the attitude; (f) Tenacity, or resistance to change; (g) Isolation from or interdependence with other attitudes. Isador Chein, "Notes on a Framework for the Measurement of Discrimination and Prejudice," Appendix C in Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook, *Research Methods in Social Relations, Part One: Basic Processes* (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), pp. 386-390.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 385.
3. Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions,* (Social Science Research Council, Bulletin No. 57, New York, 1947), p. 54.
4. Simpson and Yinger describe this characteristic human phenomenon as follows: "A tradition of prejudice not only tells the members of a group what the proper scale of social distance is, but assigns to each group a list of characteristics which are supposed to typify it. These characteristics are not wholly imaginary . . . but they are such a compound of error, exaggeration, omission and half truth that they tell more about the people who believe them, the

needs of the group in which they circulate, than about the group to which they are supposed to refer." George E. Simpson, and J. Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953), p. 141.

5. A number of studies indicate that many children manifest prejudiced attitudes as early as age three or four, and that "at most after a few years of training in intergroup attitudes, most children have acquired some measure of prejudice characteristic of their group." *Ibid.*, p. 157.
6. Horowitz writes: "Attitudes toward Negroes are now chiefly determined not by contact with Negroes, but by contact with prevalent attitude toward Negroes." Eugene L. Horowitz, "Development of Attitude Toward Negroes," *Archives of Psychology*, No. 194, (1936), pp. 34-35.
7. Everett Hughes, "The Knitting of Racial Groups in Industry," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 2, No. 5, (1946); Charles S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1943); Richard La Piere, "Attitudes Versus Actions," *Social Forces*, Vol. 13, No. 2, (1934); National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, *Segregation in Washington*, (1948).
8. Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.
9. MacIver writes: "Social reactions, including out-group prejudice, while they vary with personality traits, are expressive in diverse ways of the common need for social acceptance." Robert M. MacIver, *The More Perfect Union* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948). And Sherif: "The average individual member of a group exhibits the degree of prejudice toward the member of another group prescribed by the social distance scale of his group." Sherif, Muzafer, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1948), pp. 340-341.
10. Simpson and Yinger write: "There is much evidence to indicate that the blocking of goal-directed behavior frequently creates hostile impulses in the individual—a "free-floating," undirected hostility may result from frustration when the actual frustration agent cannot be attacked; and the social context often favors displacement of this hostility on to minority group members." Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 72. While much prejudice may be explained by the theory of displaced hostility as a response to frustration, most scientists agree that it by no means serves as a total explanation. Allport writes: "The process, while common, certainly is not universal. Whether a person adopts it or not probably depends on his own innate temperament, also upon the habits he has built up in handling frustration, and upon the total situation that prevails." Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 349. See also John Dollard, Neal Miller, and Leonard Doob, *et al., Frustration and Aggression* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939).
11. Williams writes: "The greater the insecurity, within limits, the more the hostility, and the greater the need to 'scapegoat.'" Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Simpson and Yinger point out that prejudice "may

be an attempt to enhance self-esteem or to remove a threat to self-esteem." Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

12. The authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* write: "A basically hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitive parent-child relationship is apt to carry over into a power-oriented, exploitively dependent attitude toward one's sex partner, and one's God, and may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but a desperate clinging to what appears to be strong, and a disdainful rejection of whatever is delegated to the bottom." T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, *et al.*, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), p. 971. See also Nathan Ackerman, and Marie Jahoda, *Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950); Gordon Allport, and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," *Journal of Psychology* (July, 1946).
13. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
14. Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics* (Modern Age Books, 1940).
15. Louis Wirth, "Race and Public Policy," *Scientific Monthly* (April, 1944); Milton J. Yinger, *Religion in The Struggle for Power* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1946).
16. This view is succinctly stated by a southern university professor, who writes, "The Negro long ago lost his African culture . . . but he never replaced it effectively with the Western culture that comes from Greek, Roman, and Judeo-Christian roots. The Negro still exists pretty much on the fringes of our culture. His speech, his home, his customs, his religion, his morals—all evince that fact." Norman A. Brittin, "Non-segregation, or Quality, in Schools of the Deep South?" *The Antioch Review* (Winter, 1954-55), p. 389.
17. Simpson and Yinger write: "William Graham Sumner adopted a fatalistic attitude toward social change that was widely accepted: race relations are fixed in the mores; scientific knowledge, legislation, reform efforts can have little effect. Only recently has the reduced applicability of this conception of rigid mores to modern, urban, industrial society been adequately emphasized." *Simpson and Yinger, op. cit.*, p. 11.
18. Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook write: "As a rule, prejudice and discrimination are reciprocally related: prejudice breeds discrimination; and discriminatory practices breed prejudice, since they act as a medium of indoctrination. Independently of the motives behind a particular prejudice, when this has been translated into acts of discrimination, *future generations will acquire it mainly through the influence of prevailing customs. Prejudice is mainly sustained by social usages and sanctions.*" Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart Cook, *Research Methods in Social Relations: With Especial Reference to Prejudice* (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), p. 365. McWilliams goes further, arguing that to attribute discriminatory practices to individual prejudice obscures any clear understanding of intergroup relations. Carey McWilliams, *Brothers Under the Skin* (New York: Little, Brown & Co., 1951), pp. 315-17.

19. Merton delineates four major types, based on polar combinations of the two variables: (1) the unprejudiced non-discriminator, or "all-weather liberal"; (2) the unprejudiced discriminator, or "fair-weather liberal"; (3) the prejudiced non-discriminator, or "fair-weather illiberal"; and (4) the prejudiced discriminator; or "all-weather illiberal." Robert K. Merton, "Discrimination and the American Creed," Chapter XI in *Discrimination and National Welfare,* R. M. MacIver, ed. (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949).
20. For example, Harding and Hogrefe, and Minard found that in racially mixed work situations defined as appropriate by management, the majority of white workers accepted their Negro co-workers on a basis of equality; however, outside the specific work situation, where discriminatory practices prevailed, the same white workers adapted their behavior to those practices without apparent conflict. John Harding, and Russell Hogrefe, "Attitudes of White Department Store Employees Toward Negro Co-Workers," *Journal of Social Issues,* 8, 1, (1952); Ralph D. Minard, "Race Relationships in the Pocahontas Coal Field," *Journal of Social Issues,* 8, 1, (1952).
21. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944).

CHAPTER 6.

The Minority Community

The achievement of good intergroup relations is not a one-way process. Integration across group lines involves the values, traditions, and behavior patterns of both majority and minority group persons. The current concern with the problems of desegregation has pointed up the wide gulf separating white and Negro communities. Some barriers to interracial understanding can be eliminated by obtaining a greater knowledge of the Negro community. This section sets forth some propositions dealing with the structure and perceptions of the minority community which seem to have relevance for the desegregation of schools.

A. Internal Structure of the Minority Community

1. What the general community may assume to be a homogeneous "Negro community," with all members assigned unreflectively the category of "Negroes," is actually a complexly differentiated cluster of subgroupings, varying in socio-economic status, geographic origin, occupational type, intelligence level of school children, and attitude toward school desegregation. This internal differentiation is likely to be as complex, if not more so, than the differentiation within the majority community.[1]

2. The existence of internal differentiation within the minority community need not imply a lack of solidarity within the community. But this solidarity stems more directly from a feeling of interdependence than from perceived similarities.[2]

3. The development of an aggregate from a status-category to a true ethnic collectivity stems mainly from increased communication, interaction and organization, and from the realization of a "shared fate." The greater the pressure of prejudice and discrimination, the greater is likely to be the feeling of interdependence of fate within the minority community.[3]

4. Despite the overall feeling of interdependence, there is no guarantee of unanimous sentiment in the minority community on public issues. We may expect that community problems will elicit a wide variety of reactions from the several different sub-groups of the minority community.

B. *Majority-Minority Relations*

1. Membership in a minority group precludes the opportunity for full participation in the total life of the society.[4] Although the minority community bears a functional relationship to the majority community, the patterns of interaction (prejudice, discrimination, self-insulation, avoidance patterns) tend to create a socially isolated sub-community.

2. The type of adjustment a minority group makes within the total society is affected by the degree of similarity between the basic social structure of the minority and that of the total society.[5]

3. The nature of the relationships between the minority group and the dominant group is affected not only by the internal structure of the minority group but also by the nature of its interaction with still other groups.[6]

4. The majority group is not apt to have an accurate view of the wishes or values of the minority group.[7] An asymmetry and lack of mutuality exists between the conceptions of a minority group concerning itself and the majority group, and the parallel conceptions in the dominant group.[8]

5. The minority group member is likely to have far more contact and experience with the majority than the reverse.[9]

6. The minority member is also likely to have a far more clearly articulated frame of reference on intergroup relations, a more precise awareness of the elements of intergroup contact situations, and more accuracy in diagnosis of intergroup situations than the majority group member. Hence, in many cases, a disproportionate share of the handling of new intergroup contact situations may be borne by the minority group member.

7. The lag between positive changes in the sanctions governing the acceptance of minorities, and the minority's perception of these changes, produces a discriminatory situation, regardless of actual circumstances. Hence, changes in intergroup relations practices must be accompanied by widespread diffusion of this information to the minority community.[10]

8. Minorities bring to newly desegregated situations a frame of reference and a set of expectations based on past actual and vicarious experience in environments where desegregation has not been established and maintained by administrative sanctions.[11]

C. *Reactions to Minority Group Status*

1. Segregation may be considered as an interference with the

"state of striving" in which all human beings exist; interference with this "state of striving" may lead to a disturbance of the essential psychical condition of minority youths, producing factors which foster psychological disorder.[12]

2. Alternative general reactions to minority group status are: avoidance, acceptance and aggression.[13] Among southern Negro community members, reactions to being Negro may take the form of avoidance of interracial situations, acceptance of the *status quo* in intergroup relations, or aggression toward the source of the prejudicial and discriminatory treatment.

3. Regardless of the specific adjustment reaction manifested, the minority person is likely to experience some negative feeling toward himself and his group.[14]

4. Even those who place a negative value on their minority group membership realize some positive functional significance in their membership. Wherever differences between groups are recognized, some degree of ethnocentrism and loyalty will exist. It is the interplay of the positive and negative aspects of membership which leads to ambivalence toward one's group.[15]

5. Minority group children are likely to react to their minority status with a "generally defeatist attitude and a lowering of personal ambitions."[16]

D. *Minority Community Leadership and Action*

1. Negro leaders in general, are not powerful initiators of action for their followers. Rather, they are individuals who are functionally related to their followers, and who together with them are implicated in a system of mutual obligations and expectations which has been established and maintained in group interaction.[17]

2. The further the minority community leader strays from the beliefs, sentiments, and expectations of the motivated and articulate followers of the minority community, the greater is the probability that he will be repudiated, censured or removed.

3. Even in the smallest Negro communities, there tends to be a diversity of Negro leadership types. Within the minority community, the diversity of leadership types ranges from an almost "charismatic" type of leadership, through more conventional types of organizational, prestigeful, and representative leaders, to the less noticeable but equally important types of informal opinion and "popular" leadership.[18] A major distinction concerns the militant-accommodating dichotomy in race leadership.[19]

4. There is a hypothetical optimum utilization of the existing

action potential in every Negro community, i.e., a maximal community effort. No Negro community usually employs more than a small part of this potential.[20]

5. There is little relationship between the extent of militant action to improve the status of the minority group, and the actual, objective existence of racial prejudice, segregation, and discrimination. Minority individuals are likely to be limited in their motivations to take militant action by their subjective definition of the intergroup situation.[21]

Implications for Desegregation

Communities facing the prospect of school desegregation will be attempting to integrate Negro children from an almost completely isolated sub-community. The alienating effects of social isolation from the community, from which the minority child is recruited, may be minimized, the greater efforts are made: 1. to recruit full minority participation on planning and policy-making boards in regard to desegregation; 2. to achieve full minority participation on lay school boards, PTA's, Mothers' clubs, etc.; 3. to convince minority community members of their stake and involvement in a total community program whose major goal is the welfare of school children.

The prospect of desegregation in the South will elicit a wide variety of reactions from the several different segments of the minority community; however, the fact that this is a clearly defined "racial" issue will reinforce the sentiment in the minority community that the basis of its consensus is not similarity but interdependence. However, this does not guarantee unanimous sentiment in the minority community on such subjects as desegregation. There is no racial issue on which all southern white persons will take one position and all southern Negroes will take another. The majority group probably will not view the values and aspirations of the minority group accurately in relation to its interest in desegregation. For example, the majority group is apt to ascribe the minority group's desire for school desegregation either to "outside influences," to a desire for interaction with whites as an end in itself, to a desire to enter white homes and social groups, or to marry white persons. The minority group, on the other hand, is likely to state its belief in the desirability of desegregation on the grounds of morality, democracy, desire for better educational facilities, or in protest against the high financial and psychological costs of segregation.

The actual reality of experience of Negroes in a newly desegregated area is likely to be far less uncomfortable or disturbing than the Negro person expects. Strong minority sensitivity and anxiety appropriate to past situations may become an "over-reaction" in the newly desegregated situation. Because of this sensitivity, the more ambiguous, ill-defined, or voluntary the prospect is of engaging in a newly desegregated situation, the greater is the likelihood that minority individuals will avoid the new situation and continue to use segregated facilities. Hence, the lower the element of choice involved in the selections of segregated or integrated schools, then the greater the number of minority youths who will be affected by desegregation.

School desegregation is likely to have these effects on the minority group youths: a more direct and constructive outlet for hostility; a lowering of hypersensitivity and of the tendency to sense hostility and rebuff in the well-intentioned actions of out-group members; a diminution of avoidance, withdrawal, or submissiveness reactions; a greater sense of personal dignity; a rise in personal ambition; a greater confidence and respect for their own sub-group and a lowering of ambivalence about minority group membership; a greater confidence in the American Democratic Creed and moral order. Negro youths are likely to attain higher standards of academic proficiency and exert their capacities more fully after desegregation, because of increased morale, decreased self-hatred, and a fuller sense of sharing the American Dream.

Both avoidance of the issue of school desegregation and acceptance of the general community climate of opinion are likely to perpetuate a pattern of school segregation in southern communities. The process of school desegregation is likely to depend upon the initiation of action from the minority community. Such responses are most likely to accomplish desegregation with a minimum of social disturbance where the action is rational, channelized through organized structures willing to explore methods of negotiation as well as legal action, and backed by a substantial segment of the minority community.

Attempts at negotiation between majority and minority community members in the process of desegregation must take into account the wide variety of leadership types in the minority community, and the necessity for representation of several segments of the minority community instead of a single segment. In every southern Negro community, members will be able to identify the more militant and the more accommodating type of Negro leaders easily; the former will be urging immediate school desegregation forthwith; the latter will be urging the Negroes not to antagonize the white community by insisting on immediate or full implementation of the Supreme Court decision.

The Supreme Court decision that ruled segregation illegal is likely to have a profound effect on the status of militant and accommodating Negro leadership; the militant leaders and the organizations they represent will have their status raised and their position on race matters made considerably more acceptable to the Negro community. Accommodating leaders are likely to have their status reduced and their opinions rejected by the Negro community, and increasing pressure is likely to be brought to bear on them to become more militant.

Efforts to achieve an orderly process of school desegregation in southern communities will receive the active support of only a part of each Negro community. Concerted, successful minority community pressure to accomplish school desegregation is more likely to exist where these things are taking place: 1. Identification, coordination and reconciliation of minority leadership structures; 2. Coordination, unification, and the increase of communication channels within the total minority community, with the emphasis on the needs of youths; 3. The opening of channels of communication with the general community, and the securing of support from segments of the general community; 4. Increasing contact with extra-community influences—the minority press, national intergroup organizations, state, regional and national conferences on methods of achieving desegregation.

There is likely to be little relationship between the overt manifestations of prejudice and discrimination in a southern community, and the extent of minority action to achieve school desegregation. Minority individuals are likely to be limited in their motivations to take militant action by their subjective definition of the intergroup situation, as well as by the actual extent of discrimination in the external environment.

Predictions on the extent to which a minority community will be most likely to press for school desegregation will depend not only on such factors as size of minority community, proportion of minority community and geographic region, but also on these factors: 1. Extent to which minority community is unified, and senses an "interdependence of fate" as far as desegregation is concerned; 2. Extent to which school desegregation and problems of minority youths exist as significant symbols or rallying points for united minority sentiment; 3. Extent to which the deterrents to minority leadership are minimized; 4. Extent of extra-community referents and influences that reach the maximum number of persons in the minority community.

With the exception of brief or sporadic attempts on the part of lower-status minority community members, action taken to effect school desegregation is likely to stem from the higher-status, better educated, and more "cosmopolitan" minority community members who are aware of past minority group progress sufficiently so that they feel realistically that school desegregation can be achieved.

Because of minority interest in the progress of the minority group in other areas, the southern Negro community is far more likely to be aware than the general community of the numerous successful examples of desegregation in other American areas, and to be familiar also with successful attempts at school desegregation in other communities. Therefore, the minority is far more likely to be encouraged than the general community by successful desegregation experiences in other communities, particularly their "communities of reference," and to take initiative in exploring the possibility of school desegregation in the local community.

---

1. "The notion that racial and cultural categories are internally homogeneous is, of course, belied by every serious piece of research we can find . . . In their internal complexity, our minority groupings are at one with the remarkable pluralism of American society in many other respects." Robin M. Williams, Jr., "Review and Assessment of Research on Race and Culture Conflict," *Conference on Research in Human Relations* (Rockefeller Foundation, February 27, 1953), p. 16; Arnold Rose, and Caroline Rose, *America Divided* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), p. 220 ff.
2. MacIver points out that solidarity depends less on the lack of internal differentiation than on "the absence of certain barriers to the liberation and the consequent modification or adjustment of these (internal) differences." Robert M. MacIver, *Society* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1937), p. 164. Lewin states this point more directly: "It is not similarity or dissimilarity that decides whether two individuals belong to the same or to different groups, but social interaction and other types of interdependence. A group is best defined as a dynamic whole based on interdependence rather than on similarity." Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1948), p. 184.
3. "The derivative minority group of American Negroes has been formed through association of originally heterogeneous elements made homogeneous by virtue of a common status assigned to them within America's larger society." E. K. Francis, "Variables in the Formation of So-Called 'Minority Groups,' " *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 60, (1954), p. 14.

4. Louis Wirth, "The Problems of Minority Groups," in Ralph Linton, *The Science of Man in a World Crisis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), p. 347.
5. Francis, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
6. ". . . the true unit of race and ethnic relations is not the single ethnic group, but the *situation*, embracing all the diverse groups who live in the community or region." Everett C. Hughes, and Helen M. Hughes, *Where Peoples Meet: Racial and Ethnic Frontiers* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952), p. 19. "The character of intergroup relations is determined not only by the character of relations and norms that prevail within the in-groups but also by the process of interaction between groups." Muzafer Sherif, and Carolyn Sherif, *Groups in Harmony and Tension* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953), p. 149.
7. ". . . the Negro's own rank order (of discriminations) is just about parallel, but inverse to that of the white man. The Negro resists least the discrimination on the ranks placed highest in the white man's evaluation and resents most any discrimination on the lowest level." Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1944), p. 61.
8. Tilman C. Cothran, "Negro Conceptions of White People," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 56, (1951), pp. 458-467.
9. "Minority group persons are frequently in a better position to know the true characteristics of a majority than the other way around . . . in spite of the over-simplification and distortion in the picture of the dominant group held by the dominated, it contains a larger share of truth." George Simpson and Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953), p. 141.
10. Several writers have stated, in effect, that if men define a situation as so, then it is so in its consequences. Robert K. Merton, "The Self-Fulfilling Prophesy," reprinted in *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949).
11. "Marked self-consciousness and sensitivity is characteristic of those minority group members occupying ambiguous social positions in modern America." Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (Social Science Research Council, New York, 1947), p. 60. And Newcomb writes: "Members of minority groups are apt to be 'skilled' at detecting . . . signs of prejudice . . . Sometimes, in fact, they become oversensitive . . . Such persons' over-sensitivity has made them less capable of perceiving other peoples' behavior objectively. Such perception is, of course, a part of communication." Theodore Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (New York: Dryden Press, 1950), p. 595.
12. Alexander Leighton, *The Governing of Men* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1946).
13. "Although some Negroes have scarcely encountered the 'American Dream,' many more have come in contact with it, in school, in church, in movies and magazines... Its promises, however, have little relationship to their own lives, with consequent disillusionment and frustration. The sharp contrast between promise and ful-

fillment is a highly important factor in the development of personality tendencies of minority group members." Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

14. "He wonders whether his group and he himself are worthy of no more respect than they receive. This conflict and confusion leads to self-hatred and rejection of his own group." Kenneth Clark, *Effect of Prejudice and Discrimination on Personality Development*, Fact-Finding Report, Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, Children's Bureau, Federal Security Agency, (1950), mimeographed; Donald Campbell and Boyd McCandless, "Ethnocentrisim, Xenophobia and Personality," *Human Relations*, Vol. 4, (1951), pp. 185-192; Abraham F. Citron, *et al.*, "Anti-Minority Remarks: A Problem for Action Research," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 45, (1950), pp. 99-126.
15. "Seldom are feelings of inferiority or self-hatred expressed in an unambiguous way. They are more likely to take the form of an ambivalent attitude which shows both antipathy toward and solidarity with one's group." Simpson and Yinger, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
16. This reaction ". . . is reflected in a lowering of pupil morale and a depression of the educational aspiration level among minority group children in segregated schools. In producing such effects, segregated schools impair the ability of the child to profit from the educational opportunities provided him." Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
17. Sherif and Sherif, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
18. Hugh Smythe, "Changing Patterns of Negro Leadership," *Social Forces*, Vol. 29, No. 2, (December, 1950); E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro in the United States* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949).
19. Horace Cayton, and St. Clair Drake, *Black Metropolis* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1945); Oliver C. Cox, "The New Crisis in Leadership Among Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education* Vol. 19, No. 4, (Fall, 1950).
20. "It seems that minority peoples everywhere, either because they 'want to live in peace' or for some other reason, learn to accept a social system which discriminates against them and bestows prestige upon some other group. Indeed it would be difficult, in fact impossible, for one people to dominate and exploit another if a substantial number of the minority did not more or less accept the arrangement." Brewton Berry, *Race Relations* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951), p. 419.
21. Without overlooking the importance of the cultural and regional setting, the socio-economic class, and the specific situational variables, Johnson writes: "What actually determines an individual Negro's response to discrimination is not only the external, or objective environment, but the internal, or subjective, environment. Individual attitudes and traits condition one's definition of the situation." Charles S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1943), p. 237.

PART II

Research on Desegregation

There are at present wide gaps or areas of ignorance in our knowledge of intergroup relations. Desegregation will offer an unusual opportunity to fill in some of these gaps. This section indicates some of the research possibilities presented by the current desegregation of schools in the South.

Basic and Applied Research

Research on desegregation highlights the rather artificial distinction between basic and applied research. Well-designed studies should have important implications for both the theory of intergroup relations and the practical aspects of desegregation. Too often, in the past, basic research has failed to develop the practical implications of its findings, while practical research has neglected to interpret the theoretical significance of its results.

The product of research on desegregation, therefore, has an excellent opportunity to be both basic and practical. Reports of projects could include both theoretical significance and practical implications. The various theoretical findings would undoubtedly find their way into organized and systematic analyses of the field of intergroup relations. At the same time, these findings could serve as a source of information for manuals and training guides for professionals concerned with immediate problems of race relations and public education.

The Research Context

What are the salient aspects of desegregation that have particular relevance for research? The following features deserve special mention:

1. *Widespread social change*—Desegregation affects thousands of communities in an entire geographical region. Research-wise this means the possibility of collecting data from enough communities to permit statistical generalization about community processes.

2. *Ramifications*—The social institution involved, the educational system, occupies a central position in the lives of both the individual and the community. Any change in such a significant institution is bound to have ramifications which extend into many other aspects of human behavior and community structure.

3. *Community action*—Desegregation will be marked by a great deal of community activity both for and against desegregation. In an area which requires as much public action as desegregation, many of the forces which determine collective behavior will be brought into play.

4. *High involvement*—Desegregation is a highly charged issue with great personal salience for whites and Negroes. Research in this area deals with social action that is highly significant for both individual persons and for communities.

5. *Young people*—Of a different order, but also important, is the fact that the individuals most affected will be young people. Few major social changes so directly impinge upon the young. Educational change in the South will offer an excellent opportunity to study human behavior at a time when patterns are first becoming established.

The above aspects of desegregation indicate not only the important substantive areas for study, but the inherent features of educational change in the South as well. These research areas have been divided into two sections. Section A presents a systematic evaluation of the major research approaches that have been and are being used to study intergroup relations. Each approach is appraised for its possible utility in research on desegregation. Section B offers specific examples of significant research projects that might be undertaken in the area of desegregation. These are the types of projects which, it is felt, hold the most promise for an understanding of both the basic and applied aspects of educational change in the South.

No attempt is made to indicate specific research techniques to be used. A single research study can and often does involve a variety of techniques. The emphasis of the present research appraisal has been placed upon the general approach rather than upon specific research designs or techniques.

PART II

SECTION A.

Research Approaches *

The present section is organized according to the major types of studies that have been and are being made. No attempt will be made to spell out specific research designs or techniques. Such designs must be created in accord with specific research projects involving particular localities.

Just as different techniques may be combined within the same research design, these different methods should not be viewed as mutually exclusive. In fact, there are definite advantages in using a variety of approaches to the same problem. Any organized research attack upon the problem of desegregation should certainly aim at integrating several of the approaches. If, in addition, the various approaches are used with the same sample of individuals and in the same community, the information obtained may be coordinated to the mutual advantage of each approach. The results of such research are more apt to be cumulative and easier to fit together into a systematic picture of how desegregation works.

The major types of research approaches may be classified as follows:

1. Cross-community comparisons
2. Detailed studies of community structure and function
3. Case studies of school desegregation
4. Individual behavior and attitude surveys
5. Personality studies
6. Communication and propaganda analysis
7. Case studies of collective behavior
8. Small group analysis
9. Situational analysis
10. Action research

---

* This section makes extensive use of a report, *Review and Assessment of Research on Race and Culture Conflict,* prepared by the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations and presented by Robin M. Williams, Jr. at the Conference on Research in Human Relations, Rockefeller Foundation, 1953.

Introduction

Relatively comprehensive inventories and evaluations of research in the field of intergroup relations were last published in 1947.[1] Since that time, very considerable research advances have been made; and the social importance of the topic has not diminished, to say the least. Periodic stock-takings have proven to be quite useful, and the present issue of desegregation offers an appropriate occasion to examine again where we are and where we may be able to move in the near future.

Before examining each of the specific approaches in turn, it is advisable to comment upon certain broad trends in research orientation. Reorientation has proceeded in several main directions. First of all, attention has turned more and more toward the study of actual intergroup contacts and relationships, rather than of prejudice treated in isolation from these relations. In particular, we are beginning to amass studies dealing with the changes in attitudes consequent to, or associated with, changes in intergroup contact patterns. Second, considerable effort has been devoted to "action research," which is concerned with the effects of various types of purposive action aimed at change in the attitudes or behavior of individuals and groups. Third, comparative or cross-cultural studies have re-emphasized the potential fruitfulness of a closer examination of "experiments of nature." Another area of research contributing to what we might call the relational emphasis deals with the behavior and attitudes of minority group members, and the patterns of interaction within and among ethnic, racial, and religious minorities. Finally, we have witnessed an increasingly sharp awareness of the wide variability of attitudes and behavior in different social situations — an awareness that is beginning to evoke interesting new research approaches.

With this brief preview let us turn to the more specific review and evaluation of work in this field.

CHAPTER 7.

*Cross-Community Comparisons**

One of the more encouraging signs of progress toward maturity and clarity in the field of intergroup relations is the growing emancipation from those "atomistic" studies which treat the members of different cultural and racial groupings as mere aggregates of individuals.[2] For all their shortcomings, it has been one of the great virtues of community studies that they have discerned and highlighted the basic fact that race and cultural relations *are relations*—that there is organization, recurrence, continuity, pattern, and interrelatedness in the personal interactions and correlative sentiments of the individuals who occupy culturally-stylized roles in the community. We now have clear documentation of relational qualities that are true group properties, not characteristics of individuals taken in isolation.

Comparative studies of different communities underline the great importance of the analysis of the structural problems inherent in desegregation.[3] Research at this level deals with true *group-properties*, ". . . the forms that the interrelated activities of individuals take, not simply the activities of separate individuals."[4]

For the purpose of cross-community comparisons, each community becomes a case of one and an attempt is made to find correlations between various community attributes. Relationships are sought between such independent community variables as size, income level, Negro-white ratio, and the dependent variable, experience with desegregation. This method necessitates the collection of systematic information on many community factors relevant to the course of desegregation. These factors should be descriptive of the community as a whole and as such represent true group properties. The analysis would attempt to bring out patterns which relate to the success or failure of desegregation.

The following sources of information could provide data on significant community variables:

(a) Existing statistical and demographic records.

---

* In the pages that follow, no attempt will be made to refer to all the published studies; a sampling of illustrative work seems adequate for present purposes.

(b) Records from various community institutions, i.e., schools, churches, social and political organizations, industry.

(c) Existing market research data, i.e., purchases, reading and listening habits.

(d) Analysis of local newspapers, radio programs, etc.

(e) Reports from community observers. Questionnaires could be sent to key informants asking for information about various relevant community characteristics, e.g., types and degree of discrimination, intergroup action programs.

(f) Reports from community leaders. Activity schedules could be sent to the leaders of various community organizations.

(g) Descriptive reports on the course of desegregation—to be obtained from school administrators, teachers, pupils and general public.

(h) Evaluative reports on the relative success or failure of desegregation.

Insofar as we are concerned with groups, rather than individuals studied in isolation from these contexts, we must be concerned with comparisons which will bring out *patterns* as well as item-by-item relations. Robert Angell's statistical comparisons of the social integration of American cities, for example, is basically a cross-tabulation of variables. If only one sorting variable, e.g., size of city, had been used, it would have been as valueless as if we attempted to use age alone as the basis for cross-classifying individuals in an opinion survey. The evident need for cross-community comparisons based on a pattern of variables in so-called community studies still exists, unfortunately, simply because there have not been enough cases for statistical analyses.

CHAPTER 8.

Detailed Studies of Communities

Currently, there has been a decided shift in emphasis away from studies of individual attitudes and behavior to that of community organization. Greater stress is being placed upon changed behavior as a result of changed community situations rather than of changed individuals. There is a great deal of evidence based upon experience to support this direction of thought. However, little systematic study has been done. Just as the early stages of research on intergroup relations were characterized by detailed research on individual prejudice, so that current need seems to indicate a systematic attack on the community level.

A detailed analysis of what takes place in a community during the course of desegregation should provide valuable data on the way in which community structure and function affects social change. A large part of this material would probably have to be gathered by trained observers living in the community. Such observers would report upon the activities of different officials, community leaders, organizations, etc., relative to desegregation. An attempt would be made to relate such action to the relative success or failure of desegregation. Studies of the community processes which lead up to the decision to desegregate should be extremely illuminating, especially as to how the local power structure operates.

It is particularly important that such community observation studies include the Negro community. The situation and behavior of minority groups may be categorized under three main headings: (1) degree and kind of intergroup communication and interaction with (a) other minorities, (b) the dominant majority group; (2) attitudinal reactions and personality characteristics resulting from minority status; (3) internal differentiation of the minority population.

The communication and interaction of any "minority" racial or cultural grouping with the dominant group is, of course, only one pole of a two-sided relationship. What is viewed from one pole as a "stimulus" is seen as a "response" from the other. While this was very clear to some earlier students of race relations, it has tended to become obscured by the focus of the present generation upon "majority prejudice," although everything we know about human social behavior points to its inherently reciprocal nature. During the past five years, a number of students in this field have reminded us again that attention must be directed to both sides of any given relationship between groups.[5] Although we expect the same scientific principles to apply to the behavior of minorities as we do to dominant groups, the special features of minority status do invest this subject with additional interest. The psychological field of individuals in a suppressed or deprived minority is constricted and structured in ways which are unique to such a social position.[6]

Certain purely descriptive data concerning minority reactions are of direct usefulness in considerations of social policy. Because of barriers to communication and understanding, the members and leaders of one racial or cultural group often do not actually know the aspiration and values of the other.[7]

The depth and intensity of minority group reactions to suppression, deprivation and "tolerance" has been repeatedly documented. Also, further evidence has been accumulated as to the nature and sources of self-rejection or "self-hatred" among minority group members.[8]

Chapter 9.

Case Studies of School Desegregation

Desegregation presents an unparalleled opportunity for the detailed study of how change is brought about within an existing institution. The study of how policy is formed and carried out in the school system will have direct relevance for an understanding of many other institutions.

The process by which school desegregation takes place *within the school system* should be carefully reported. Various methods and techniques for desegregation should be described, including an account of the actual procedure by which the technique was introduced and carried through. Incidents taking place in the schools should be documented. Such reports on the process of desegregation should come from all levels: school administrator, teachers, pupils, school organizations, etc.

Case studies of local community school systems can focus on: (a) the processes leading up to the decision to comply with the Supreme Court ruling; or on (b) the processes of the planning and accomplishing of change-over to non-segregated schooling.

Social scientists who are in a position to study in detail the desegregation of schools in their own community only should probably try to establish lines of communication among themselves so that they can share each other's data and highlight its significance by critical comparisons. Case studies of this sort could set up a minimum number of areas they would try to document. Crucial areas would be: (a) the firmness or laxness with which policy and procedure are announced and communicated; (b) the clarity of specification of objectives; (c) the amount of voluntary choice permitted white and Negro students and its effects; (d) the teachers' perception of what is expected of them; (e) the amount of staff anxiety, the concern it creates, in turn, and the administrator's handling of it; (f) the extent of participation of staff, both white and Negro, in the details of change-over.

The success of community and school studies will depend a great deal upon the careful selection of critical cases of successful and unsuccessful desegregation. Sampling variables would probably include size of community and school, Negro-white ratio, location in the South, level of community prejudice, degree of intergroup action, etc. Many of these crucial variables could probably be defined best on the basis of cross-community comparisons.

CHAPTER 10.

Individual Behavior and Attitude Surveys

Much of the research on intergroup relations in the past has centered upon the level and determinants of individual prejudices. Today we note a major shift in research interest. Although the long-popular "attitude studies" continue to appear, an apparently increasing proportion utilize sophisticated scaling methods, and are less concerned with the straight reporting of mass attitudes than with the relation of particular attitudes to personality, on the one hand, and to interpersonal behavior on the other. The presentation of static data on aggregate opinions is giving way to analyses which attempt to isolate the *components* of concrete attitudes and to relate these systematically to other social and psychological variables.

In addition, more attention is being paid to the basic operational definition of the variables subsumed under the global term "prejudice." In view of the very substantial technical advances of the past decade, there would seem to be little justification henceforth for failure to search for scalar components rather than what might be called "cloud clusters" of *ad hoc* indicators.

Concurrently with a more sophisticated approach to the study of attitudes, we find in recent years a greater tendency to view public opinion as a political process rather than as an aggregate of individual opinions. Studies of public opinion concerning desegregation should benefit from this increased awareness that the study of public opinion requires not only the analysis of which groups hold what opinions, but also how these opinion affect the course of political events.

Another current shift in thought involves a further de-emphasis of attitudes and an increased stress on actual behavior in intergroup situations. Reorientation has proceeded in several main directions. First of all, attention has turned more and more toward the study of actual intergroup contacts and relationships, rather than of prejudices treated in isolation from these relations. In particular, we are beginning to study changes in attitudes consequent to, or associated with, changes in intergroup contact patterns.

The interest in interaction derives part of its impetus from practical or policy interests, especially in connection with legal struggles over segregation and discrimination in political life, education, employment, and public facilities and accommodations. It has been argued by many that the control of discrimination is more feasible than the control of prejudice.[9]

Researches on the effects of interracial interaction have largely concentrated upon formalized social situations in which there is a measure of authoritative control over the behavior of the interacting persons—military organizations, public housing projects, factories, boys' camps. The direct study of interactional patterns, as reported in recent publications, has been confined to areas outside the South. Within the limits of such coverage, however, the studies show that integration of whites and Negroes in situations of social interaction is accompanied and followed by an overall reduction in the prejudices of white people toward Negroes.[10]

This conclusion decisively refutes widely held common sense assumptions, and is clearly of great practical importance. The essential scientific problem here, however, concerns what variables, and relations among them, may be used to explain the *different outcomes of different kinds of interaction in various types of situations.*

New light thrown upon the development of concepts, stereotypes, and intergroup attitudes in young children makes the study of the effect of desegregation upon students' attitudes particularly timely. It seems clear from general theory and from available studies that very young children do not manifest prejudice: the notion of instinctive aversion has been effectively shattered; we know prejudice to be a learned response; we know that the elaboration of concepts requires extensive learning.[11]

The essential point is that perception is selective and that this selectivity is in part determined by the actor's interests, needs, values, and capacities.[12] Both the actor's immediate "needs" and his cultural frame for perceiving are involved. In the case of "social perception" of other human beings, the cultural definition is of paramount importance. It is for this reason that changes in mutual perception of Negroes and whites resulting from desegregation are of such great interest.

Perhaps the *shift* in research emphasis most relevant to desegregation has been the increased interest in *patterns of discrimination* (or differential behavior) over *individual attitudes* (stereotypes, antipathies, and so on). From the 1920's into the late 1940's there were a large number of studies which attempted to describe individuals' stereotypes of racial and cultural groupings, their feelings of social distance, their expressions of liking and disliking. The great majority of these studies were too static and sheerly descriptive, and they tended to treat "prejudice" as an unanalyzed aggregate of individual attitudes, divorced from the functioning of real personalities and from enduring social relations and the structural properties of groups and communities. Desegregation offers an excellent opportunity for studying individual attitudes within a highly meaningful community context and relating such attitudes to community patterns of discrimination.

CHAPTER 11.

Personality Studies

A basic point of the Supreme Court decision dealt with the detrimental effect of segregated schools upon the personality of Negro children. This again represents a new development which promises substantial rewards for good research. There can be little doubt that the current upheaval will affect the personality development of both Negro and white children. Of particular significance is the fact that the stimulus is one of social stress, since the pioneering ground in the behavioral sciences today is concerned with the relationship between social stress and personality disorder.

In the years since World War II, probably the most prominent single research interest directly related to race and culture conflict has been in the exploration of the connections between prejudice and various psychological processes and personality characteristics.[13] The general portrait of the prejudiced personality emerging from the series of studies at the University of California is well known.[14] One of the important questions concerning the studies, in the mold of those reported in *The Authoritarian Personality*, is whether the intercorrelation of prejudices toward various minorities represents a relatively fixed syndrome derived from *basic personality dynamics*, or whether it exists only in a particular type of *cultural context.*

The whole question as to what is to be considered as "personality" in the personality-prejudice equation deserves further attention. We have found that certain of the California items, presumed to index personality qualities, correlate meaningfully with education, sex and age, and vary enormously from one community or cultural group to another. This may suggest a re-examination of the possibility that what is sometimes called "personality" might be better thought of as cultural characteristics, resulting from conformity to a common social situation.

Furthermore, the "prejudice of conformity" is not necessarily the active, rigidly categorical hostility of the emotionally disturbed bigot. It is quite likely that the "bigot" in certain Deep South communities often may be in a straightforward sense, less "neurotic" than the racial liberal in that setting. There are fragments of data indicating that the extreme liberal and the extreme bigot may be rather alike in personality characteristics, and quite different from persons holding more moderate positions on racial and cultural issues.[15]

The consistency and continuity of personality may well be phenomena of values and concepts as well as "habits" and concrete behavior. Were this not so, behavior would be hopelessly rigid—for the "same" pattern of action has different meanings and carries different values in different situations. Thus, the organized pattern of the personality may be clear and self-consistent, but we call it "psychotic" unless the person can accept the "disturbances" introduced by other personalities interacting with the individual in concrete situations. It is probably not to be expected that anything like trait psychology will be of much help to us in this area—any more than it has been in criminology.[16] The regularities which we call personality are not to be deduced from any list of "needs" or "predispositions." Instead, the regularities are dynamic processes observed by the scientist through generalizing concepts and stabilized for the actor by the same means.

These considerations point clearly to the need for research specifying the functional role of prejudice in the total dynamics of personality-in-social-setting.[17] We have ample evidence that the individual's action and expressed beliefs and attitudes represent *commitments* ". . . either an endorsement of his social group, and therefore a bond of social unity, or an expression of conflict with it." (Thus) "The racial sentiment of Southerners is only in part directed to Negroes; it is also a function of their most significant ties to family, neighborhood, and group . . . the individual must in the course of growth establish a relation of trust to his immediate group. The racial outlook derives much of its psychological force from this source."[18]

In summary, our primary needs in relation to research on desegregation, as we have sensed them in our operations with respect to personality and prejudice, are:

(a) The careful study of the relation of *personality*, as indexed by tests and interviews, and *prejudice*, as indexed by tests and interviews, to personality and prejudice in emotionally-involved behavior in real-life situations, such as those involved in desegregation.

(b) The *comparative* study of personality characteristics as related to prejudice in *different sociological environments.*

(c) The quantitative and qualitative mapping of prejudice in different portions of community structure—above all, with respect to *power* and *communicative* influence, as such influence is brought to bear on desegregation.

(d) The observation of *change* in prejudice and discrimination concomitant with environmental changes brought about by desegregation.

Chapter 12.

Communication and Propaganda Analysis

A large proportion of early research in intergroup relations concerned the development of prejudice and the analysis of propaganda. Such research has currently fallen into disrepute. Little enthusiasm can be raised for studies on the effect of propaganda upon atttitudes.[19] Desegregation, however, can provide an excellent crucial test for many of the current controversial hypotheses concerning attitude change through propaganda. Such testing would indicate whether the behavioral sciences are being premature in their devaluation of propaganda. It could also serve to test new advances in communication theory and the more sophisticated use of propaganda in terms of group process and attitude change.[20]

Investigations of attitude changes as a result of purposive educational programs should direct themselves to specific types of changes, rather than simply to whether or not attitudes become more or less favorable. Another point seems basic here. It is commonly, and tacitly, assumed that the verbal indorsement of stereotyped statements about racial and cultural groupings represents "real prejudice," or at least a "real attitude." Much further investigation remains to be done, however, to determine the actual *meaning* of stereotypes to the persons who subscribe to them, and especially the *salience* of stereotypes and the *intensity* of commitment to them.

It should be noted that much of the significant relevant work on the basic problem of the dynamics of the communication process is to be found in research which is not directed specifically to intergroup relations. The testing of an interrelated set of hypotheses on communication, group membership, and resistance to attitude change seems likely to produce findings of wide applicability to the problem of desegregation.

Since the issue of desegregation will occupy the attention of the public for a long time, many communication and propaganda studies of a long-range nature can be made. In selected communities, careful records might be kept over a period of time of the content of the various media of communication and of the propaganda or information made available to the public on desegregation. A content analysis would indicate how such propaganda changes with time from community to community. The above information could then be related to the progress of desegregation in the community.

It might be possible in a carefully selected community to conduct an experiment with an "ideal" information program. The model of such a program is given in "The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions" by Robin M. Williams, Jr. Other research studies listed by Williams on the effects of information, education and propaganda which apply to the process of desegregation include:

(a) Audiences reached and their reactions to mass educational and propagandist materials.

(b) Relative effectiveness of alternative media for mass education and propaganda.

(c) Differential effects of alternative types of propaganda appeals.

(d) Comparison of behavioral and opinion changes associated with contrasting types of teaching on intergroup relations.

(e) Effectiveness of a program of education in intergroup relations for public officials.

(f) Effects of 'workshop' training in intergroup relations upon teachers' opinions and performances.

(g) Effects of specific training programs upon intergroup behavior of community leaders.

(h) Majority group reactions to changes in minority behavior.

(i) Differential reactions to materials for education and propaganda among various classes and sectional groups.

(j) An experiment on group influence upon individuals' attitudes in an educational situation.

CHAPTER 13.

Case Studies of Collective Behavior

Impinging as directly as it does upon public custom and opinion, reactions to desegregation are bound to be widespread. Large numbers of people will be caught up in the process and much of what happens will take on the characteristic of mass behavior. Desegregation, thus, can supply new information about how individuals behave when caught up in a mass process. Many of these studies would focus upon the "pathology" of public reaction. This would include the study of such phenomena as conflict and riots, rumors, panic, etc. Such studies should contribute to our growing knowledge of how individuals behave in crowds.

Momentary hostility presumably is a reaction to a *specific* situation of frustration, goal-blockage, insult, deprivation, and the like. But in the case of *continuing* hostility it may be that there is not a sort of "reservoir" of hatred that presses for release like fluid in an hydraulic system under pressure. It is more nearly that the actor, by symbolic means, can create a continuing "feed-back" system which recurrently activates the hostility-evoking stimuli. It is true, of course, that the hostility may become detached from its original instigations—as when long-continued humiliation in one's work relations generates a hostility cycle which is transferred to minority groups, political figures, other nations, and so on. But this is not a simple "deflection" of hostility from one object to another: the deflection occurs through a *re-definition* of the situation, and there is not the simple persistence of an initially aroused unit of hostility.[21]

Future research concerning the role of hostility in racial and cultural conflict may find it profitable to re-examine certain basic hypotheses. Experience in a series of studies in American communities indicates that much discrimination is *not* based upon hostile feelings, and that aggressive intergroup behavior on the part of the majority group people appeared most often to be a *reaction to* what was to these people a threatening change in status or relationships considered to be normal.

A detailed record should be kept of all instances of open conflict. Whenever such conflict occurs, an attempt should be made to find out the reasons for and the course of the conflict. If possible a "barometer" might be developed to measure the level of tension in different communities. Rumors should be investigated in terms of both content, initiation, course and effect.

CHAPTER 14.

Small-Group Analysis

Relevant findings for desegregation have emerged from studies of the functioning of small groups. A challenging set of hypotheses has been presented by George Homans. To paraphrase only two examples:

> 1. All other things being equal, the more frequently persons interact with one another, the more alike they tend to become in their activities and sentiments and in the social norm to which they are oriented. And, the more frequently they interact the stronger will become their feelings of liking or friendliness toward one another. However, these relationships hold only if the initial roles of the participants are not too sharply differentiated and if there is initially a minimal base of common or congruent interests.
>
> 2. When persons interact frequently in a relation of super-subordination, their sentiments toward one another will be ambivalent and the amount of interaction will tend toward the minimum necessary for the specific roles in question.[22]

Festinger and associates have presented data on social processes in proximity-groups and on informal communication in small groups.[23] They find, for example, that:

> "When there is a range of opinion in the group, communications tend to be directed toward those members who are at the extremes of the range." And: "The greater the pressure toward uniformity and the greater the perception of homogeneous group-composition, the greater is the tendency to communicate to these extreme opinions."[24]

Since we have reason to think that some of the most powerful forces influencing behavior are generated in face-to-face groups, our understanding of relations *across* group lines will stand to gain from research on the internal dynamics of groups of various kinds. Furthermore, attitudes toward racial and cultural groupings tend to be formed and reinforced in small, intimate, homogeneous social groups to such an extent that definite stereotypes and antipathies are found among persons who have little or no direct contact with individuals belonging to the out-groups in question. Work should be initiated on the intriguing problem of the perception of *group* properties. For example, simplified representations of small-group interactions apparently elicit direct apprehension of personal interrelations.

A large part of intergroup relations in modern urban societies takes the form of mediating links *between sub-groups as such* rather than of a diffuse web of direct personal interaction.

Such mediating links are maintained by persons who act as informal "representatives" of segments of the communities, and the resulting relationships have special characteristics, e.g., it seems likely that these relationships are more easily disrupted than the internal relationships of small groups, but on the other hand, the *personal* affinities and repulsions are less important than in ordinary interpersonal relations.

Desegregation should present many opportunities for the study of small groups involved in its processes. Such research could involve classroom groupings, extracurricular activity groups, teacher groups, groups of community officials concerned with desegregation, parent groups and community groups formed to meet the problems of desegregation. Interaction process analysis would contribute much toward our understanding of how such groups function.

CHAPTER 15.

Situational Analysis

In the intergroup relations field we have long been aware of the important role that the situational context plays in determining behavior. Nevertheless, most research in this field has not given adequate attention to the situational aspects of behavior. Research has been focused largely on *attitudes* toward minority groups. More recently there have been studies of the operating *patterns* of behavior in intergroup relations. But most attitude research has stopped with the study of how attitudes operate in *interview situations* and has not gone on to study how they operate in actual intergroup situations. And most research on patterns of behavior has stopped with the documentation of the relations of social structure to discriminatory behavior, but has not gone on to relate these to the attitudes of the particular people involved.

Although the research difficulties are tremendous, some progress has been made in studying the relation between attitudes expressed in one situation to attitude expressions and other behavior in other situations. The basic problem here has traditionally been formulated as the problem of "attitudes vs. actions," or of the predictive value of attitudes (elicited in a research situation by interview, test, or other techniques) for behavior in "real life" situations. It has been recognized for a long time that there is extremely wide variation in the degree to which research-elicited attitudes correspond, in this sense, to other relevant behaviors of the persons studied.[25] Detailed studies of situations has revealed many clues as to the specific combinations of variables which lead to these very different outcomes. Those studies point up the importance of the individuals and groups which are in the actor's field of reference at the time at which the immediate situation is defined. Seen in terms of such varying referents and the accompanying expectations and values, much seeming inconsistency becomes understandable and to a degree predictable.[26] There is a pressing need, however, to expand a vigorous and imaginative program of further research in this area. We now have abundant evidence of situational variability, and this is a major achievement, but it is not enough. It is time to leave the A-B-C level of description and move into the systematic investigation of the conditions under which attitudes and action are or are not consistent or stable.[27]

A large number of hypotheses are quickly generated by situational analysis. The urgent need is to develop techniques of field investigation and of controlled experimentation that will permit rigorous testing of the rich store of questions that can now be formulated. We have to overcome major obstacles—the inaccessibility to observe many important real-life situations, the difficulty of relating survey data to those situations we are able to observe, the ethical and operational hazards of situations contrived for research purposes, the clumsiness of available techniques of recording the kind of data needed.

Out of these considerations, it is the present view that an important area of opportunity for new knowledge lies in the study of the behavior derived from different modes of personality organization in the varied situations that desegregation will offer. After all, our practical interest is ultimately not so much in the attitudes of abstracted personality systems as it is in "normal" personalities behaving in certain types of situations.

It is suggested that the approach to problems of prejudice-and-personality which is most likely to be immediately fruitful stems from the question: how can we relate personality and social structure through definite research operations? Current studies already suggest a systematic patterning of out-group acceptance according to the degree of prejudice in combination with the degree of social acceptability of a given behavior in the social group or situation in which the individual is acting.

An intergroup situation may be defined in terms of the relationship between the operating practices which apply to the situation and the prejudicial attitudes which belong to the participants. As the situation becomes accepted as appropriate and as the participants become unprejudiced, the intergroup relationships take on a positive character. Similarly, as the situation becomes defined as unacceptable and as the participants become prejudiced, the intergroup relationships become negative. This interplay between social practice and prejudiced personality may be diagrammed as follows:

SOCIAL PRACTICE

PREJUDICE	*Not Acceptable*	*Controversial*	*Appropriate or Acceptable*
"Bigot"	Defensive resistance	Articulate objection	Reluctant acceptance
"Gentle people of prejudice"	Rationalized rejection	Situational exemption	Limited acceptance
"Unprejudiced"	Passive rejection	Uneasy acceptance	Friendly acceptance

Even a typology as provisional as this shows the possibility of relating, in actuality and not just in lip service, the overlapping systems of culture, personality, and social situation.

Chapter 16.

Action Research

Considerable effort in the field of intergroup relations has been devoted to "action research," which is concerned with the effects of various types of purposive action aimed at change in the attitudes or behavior of individuals and groups. Such "action research" will undoubtedly characterize much of the research interest relating to desegregation, which, after all, is a very real problem involving high stakes.

It remains true that much action-oriented research is ephemeral because of the highly dated and localized nature of the findings. Yet there is much of general scientific interest in experiments on incident control, group belongingness, and urban community tensions. The limitations of mass propaganda have been illuminated by several studies.

There has been some tendency to import the approach of commercial market research into action research in America: a focus upon activities having a mass impact, a tendency to test standardized "packages" of educational or propaganda materials, an emphasis upon quick results. In view of our present knowledge, it is reasonable to doubt that race and culture conflict can be appreciably alleviated by conventional methods of mass education. So far as research opportunities are concerned, it would appear that the most promising area of study here is rather that of the attitude and behavioral change which result from education in group situations.

An aspect of desegregation of particular interest to a theory of action is the role of legislation in bringing about social change. Frazier has pointedly reminded his sociological colleagues that race relations in the modern urban situation are "in the mores" to a limited extent only—i.e., regulated by rigid informally-mediated controls and unquestioningly accepted social norms—but rather they are strongly shaped by the organized actions of special-interest groupings. Lohman, Bradbury and others who studied segregation in Washington, D. C., found themselves attributing crucial importance to power relationships as these determined law, administrative regulations, and formal operating practices.[28]

The case for the effectiveness of legal action in changing intergroup relations has found an impressive list of supporters during the past decade. The older doctrines which stressed the slowness of change in the mores and the ineffectiveness of legislation or regulation which conflicted with customary practices have been under heavy assault for some time.[29] A great deal more research and thinking will be necessary in order to identify and measure the conditions which account for the varying effects of legislation and other authoritative controls. Nevertheless, the desegregation ruling provides us with a massive "natural laboratory." Even if only rough control of the variables can be achieved, further research on this topic is a legitimate and useful line of endeavor. Among the promising sub-topics is the *educative* effects of legislation—effects that have often been ignored or misevaluated—and the types and degrees of resistance to the new regulation.

One action research approach that would probably be illuminating would be to try to win support for desegregation from a number of different audiences using roughly the same approach. The research should show the kinds of settings where a direct action approach is feasible. Various types of community groups, both organized and unorganized, could be approached with some well thought out campaign to win support for desegregation. Equally fruitful might be research that tried different types of approach using similar (matched, if possible) groups, e.g., women's church club groups.

Another useful area of research would deal with public attitudes toward the use of legislation. Saenger and Gordon found that very few people in a New York City sample know enough about the New York State Law Against Discrimination to be able to complain to the enforcing agency, and many prefer evasion of discrimination to direct action against it.[30]

CHAPTER 17.

Conclusions on Research Approaches

This review of major research approaches has touched at numerous points upon three main questions: What is the current status of the approach? What obstacles does it face and how may we surmount or avoid them? and, What opportunities lie ahead for the use of this approach in the study of desegregation? A few summary remarks may be useful.

Remarks on this topic tend to have a certain uniform quality of triteness that probably derives from our familiarity with the same obstacles in all fields of behavioral science. The well-known list includes an allegedly excessive complexity of the phenomena of interest, a recalcitrance of the problems to experimental control, ethical dilemmas of research concerned with human beings, the "touchiness" of the subject matter, the difficulties of precise measurement, the insufficiencies of conceptualization and theory, and scattered and non-cumulative distribution of research effort. All of these obstacles apply to research on desegregation.

Historically, one major difficulty seems to have been especially successful in plaguing all sciences at various points in their development; namely, the problem of posing questions which clearly focus upon the antecedent-consequent relation of unambiguous variables. The history of science seems to show that much sheer description and many fumbling efforts to classify phenomena into predictively useful classes precedes the emergence of clearly defined variables which can be used to establish invariant relationships. In the study of desegregation, we can not yet dispense with such exploratory work. There will remain a continuing need for systematic reporting of the relevant details of the desegregation process as it goes on in community after community. This is no substitute for the intensive studies which test hypotheses through more rigorous designs. But descriptive explorations are often an indispensable guide for the best selection of problems and sample populations. And they are notably valuable to "social meteorology"—for planning and action in the stormy weather of intergroup relations.

There is a hazard in all this. It is entirely possible that one of the key limitations of research on problems of desegregation will simply be *the attempt to do too much.* Generally, research workers in the area of intergroup relations are keenly aware of the numerous expectations and demands for the delivery of results that are immediately important for the wide range of problems that desegregation poses. If they strive to meet these demands fully, they may tend to scatter their fire. In the long run, it is likely that maximum progress will be made by the slow processes of methodological improvement, by further analytic dissection of such global concepts as prejudice, through the drudgery of repeated testing of findings—in short, by the well-known, undramatic work which is typical of any empirical research field.

There is perhaps one feature of this subject which does deserve special mention.

The laws, generalizations, or credible hypotheses of greatest immediate social interest and applicability are often not those which state a predictable relationship between two variables with all other variables constant. Rather they are those which are cast in what might be called a "complex-adequate" form. The complex-adequate hypothesis typically deals with several interrelated variables, all of which are necessary conditions for the consequent condition—in this case, successful desegregation—that we wish to predict or control, but none of which alone is a sufficient condition. It attempts an optimal decision between the rigor of the simple, analytic, abstract hypothesis, and the complexity of concrete events.

It seems reasonable to believe that this type of thinking will gain from a closer articulation of research on desegregation with the findings and theories of general psychology, anthropology and sociology. There is likely to be a greater utilization of the data and formulations of experimental studies of perception, motivation, learning, and communication and opinion formation in groups.

There is, in this way, the logical possibility of an organized, inter-dependent series of studies on desegregation which will move from phenomena of individual personality through small groups to larger social structures. In making the preceding review and appraisal, it is striking how frequently one finds that the fulfillment of crucial research needs depends upon advances in research methods—upon more valid and reliable measuring instruments, and more ingenious and better controlled study designs. Nothing could be plainer than that desegregation will create a great number of socially important problems, for many of which research can be made to bear directly upon key points of scientific theory. And we already have literally hundreds of hypotheses which pose significant questions for inquiry. In short, we already know enough to have a firm base of operations and to put important questions to nature. It seems to us that the primary need and the primary opportunity for most rapid progress at this time lie on the methodological side.

Finally, we may express the hope that in the end we shall not be studying just Negro-white relations, but analyzing *the relations between differently situated and differently categorized persons*, even though selecting our cases all from race relations. We will be able to discern similarities and differences between racial relations and the relations of young and old, men and women, sick and well, upper and lower status-groupings, urbanites and ruralites; we shall want to be alert to research on small groups, labor union structure, cliques within bureaucracies. In other words, we hope to find the study of race groupings and their conflicts and adjustments a vehicle for lasting contributions to the development of general social science.

PART II—SECTION A

1. Arnold M. Rose, *Studies in Reduction of Prejudice* (American Council on Race Relations, Chicago, 1947); Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions* (Social Science Research Council, New York, 1947). In the interest of brevity this paper will largely pass over the earlier appraisals by Rose and Williams, in order to focus more intensively upon developments during more recent years.
2. E. Franklin Frazier, "Race Contacts and Social Structure," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 14, (February, 1949), pp. 1-10.
3. In actual practice, the contribution of cross-cultural studies in this field, although substantial, seems less than *a priori* might be expected. There is a primary obstacle that goes far to explain this situation, namely, that most American community studies and most studies of other cultures have really been individual "case studies."
4. Solomon E. Asch, *Social Psychology* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York: 1952), p. 225.
5. Thus Gordon Allport has argued for the importance of research on the "stimulus side": ". . . until we know to what extent our generalized antipathy is based on provocative fact, we shall not be able to determine the extent of the irrationality that remains." "Prejudice: A Problem in Psychological and Social Causation," in T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (editors), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 370. The other side of this particular problem is the functional significance of membership in and identification with a distinctive cultural

group. Arnold Rose, *The Negro's Morale: Group Identification and Protest* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1949). This work sketches the development of group identification among Negroes and its significance in the fight against discrimination and segregation. See also: Ira De A. Reid, "The Socialization of the Negro in the American Social Order," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 19, (1950), pp. 780-787.

6. For example, interminority prejudice may be hypothesized to function in certain situations as a means of defending a severely threatened sense of status and security, and to combine in a complex manner with ambivalent tendencies to seek a basis of identification and contact with members of the majority group. Cf. Kenneth B. Clark, "Racial Prejudices Among American Minorities," *International Social Science Bulletin*, Vol. 3, No. 4, (1950), pp. 506-513.
7. For example, Myrdal's, *An American Dilemma* suggested that Negroes' aspirations were in reverse order of those attributed to them by southern white people and that Negroes want the abolition of just those discriminatory patterns which whites are most willing to give up. A recent local study provides some additional confirmation. W. S. M. Banks, II, "Rank Order of Sensitivity to Discriminations of Negroes in Columbus, Ohio," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 4, (1950), pp. 529-534.
8. Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie P. Clark, "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," *Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 19, (1950), pp. 341-350; Ralph K. White, "Black Boy: A Value-Analysis," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 42, (1957), pp. 440-461.
9. Robert M. MacIver, *The More Perfect Union* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), p. 247: "It is more effective to challenge conditions than to challenge attitudes or feelings."
10. Within the limits of such coverage, however, there is high consistency in the findings with regard to Negro-white interaction. In the Army, in the Merchant Marine, in governmental organizations, in housing projects, the studies show that integration of whites and Negroes in situations of social interaction is accompanied and followed by an overall reduction in the prejudices of white people toward Negroes. Samuel A. Stouffer, *et al., The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949), Vol. I, pp. 586-595. Ira N. Brophy, "The Luxury of Anti-Negro Prejudice," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 9, (1945-1946), pp. 456-466. Barbara K. MacKenzie, "The Importance of Contact in Determining Attitudes Toward Negroes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, (1948), pp. 417-441. Morton Deutsch and Mary Evans Collins, *Interracial Housing: A Psychological Evaluation of a Social Experiment* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951), and "Intergroup Relations in Interracial Public Housing: Occupancy Patterns and Racial Attitudes," *Journal of Housing*, Vol. 7, (1950); Daniel M. Wilner, Rosabelle Price Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook, "Residential Proximity and Intergroup Relations in Public Housing Projects," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 8, (1952), pp. 45-69.

11. Recent studies have shown out-group rejection responses and surprisingly definite stereotypes even at nursery school and kindergarten levels. Mary Ellen Goodman, *Race Awareness in Young Children* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1952); Helen G. Trager and Marian Radke Yarrow, *They Learn What They Live* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1952); R. B. Ammons, "Reactions in a Projective Doll-Play Interview of White Males Two to Six Years of Age to Differences in Skin Color and Facial Features," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, Vol. 76, (1950), pp. 323-341.
12. Alfred R. Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss, *Social Psychology* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1949), p. 65: "What is selected and emphasized in perceiving is connected with the observer's perspective, with his value system, interests, needs, and the like."
13. A summary and appraisal of much of this work is provided by Otto Klineberg, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research* (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 62, 1950).
14. Persons most prejudiced against ethnic, religious and racial minorities are reported to manifest "conventionalized" social conformity with deep ambivalence toward social norms and the authorities enforcing them, a puritanical conscience, repressed hostility toward parents, admiration of power and strength, advocacy of severe punishment, status-anxiety, repressed sexuality, a rigidly dichotomous style of thinking, a tendency to distrust other people, and to view the world as evil and dangerous. Summarized by T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950).
15. Percy Black, "White-Negro Relations: A Different Slant," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 14, No. 3, (September, 1949), pp. 261-262; and Morris L. Haimowitz and Natalie Reader Haimowitz, "Reducing Ethnic Hostility through Psychotherapy," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 31, second half, (1950), pp. 231-241.
16. The net result of some 113 relevant studies is a failure to demonstrate a consistent relation between "traits" and "criminality." Karl F. Schuessler and Donald R. Cressey, "Personality Characteristics of Criminals," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 55, (March 1950), pp. 476-484.
17. N. W. Ackerman and M. Jahoda, "Toward a Dynamic Interpretation of Anti-Semitic Attitudes," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 18, (1948), pp. 163-173.
18. Solomon E. Asch, *Social Psychology* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 577.
19. The limitations of mass propaganda have been illuminated by several studies. For example: Samuel H. Flowerman, "Mass Propaganda in the War Against Bigotry," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 42, (1947), pp. 429-439.
20. A suggestive set of hypotheses on problems in this area has been advanced by Jeanne Watson on the basis of detailed interviews with individuals who have changed their attitudes toward Negroes or Jews. Jeanne Watson, "Some Social and Psychological Situations

Related to Change in Attitude," *Human Relations*, Vol. III, No. 1, (February, 1950).

21. Hypotheses concerning the sources of aggression have been only part of the research picture in the area of present interest. Two terms have become especially popular in the literature dealing with the relation between prejudice and other aspects of personality: "rigidity" and "intolerance of ambiguity." Rokeach had referred to "generalized mental rigidity." Experiments such as that by Wyatt and Campbell (built upon the prior study by David Galloway) had indicated that adequacy of perception could be impaired by inducing a "set" due to previous unverified hypothesizing or guessing. Block and Block used the number of trials necessary to establish a norm in autokinetic-effect experiments as an index of intolerance of ambiguity, and found a significant relationship to ethnocentrism. Milton Rokeach, "Generalized Mental Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, (1948), pp. 259-278; D. F. Wyatt and D. T. Campbell, "On the Liability of Stereotype or Hypothesis," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 41, No. 4, (October, 1946), pp. 496-500; Jack Block and Jeanne Block, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Intolerance of Ambiguity and Ethnocentrism," *Journal of Personality*, Vol. XIX, (Sept. 1950-June 1951), pp. 303-311.
22. George C. Homans, *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950), pp. 120-126, 133 and 116.
23. L. Festinger, S. Schachter, and K. Back, *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951).
24. Leon Festinger and John Thibaut, "Informal Communication in Small Groups," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol. 46, (1951).
25. In the special field of intergroup attitudes, the problem has been considered by La Piere, Merton, Jahoda, Myrdal, Rose, John Dollard, Gerhart Saenger, and many others.
26. Current social science interest in this problem is reflected in the fact that an entire number of the *Journal of Social Issues* (1949, No. 3) has been devoted to articles on the topic of consistency and inconsistency.
27. This point is well made and supported by data in: Wilbur Brookover and John B. Holland, "An Inquiry into the Meaning of Minority Group Attitude Expressions," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, (1952), pp. 196-202. As an example of the kind of hypotheses which might be subjected to this systematic testing we may cite the generalization advanced by Rogler for situations observed in Puerto Rico: if the definition of the situation is secular and impersonal, the behavior in the situation evinces little or no race distance. C. Rogler, "Some Situational Aspects of Race Relations in Puerto Rico," *Social Forces*, Vol. 27, (1948), pp. 72-77. The same point has been made by E. Franklin Frazier, *American Sociological Review*, (1949), *op. cit.*, p. 8. A second example is provided by

Donald Pierson's conclusion from a study of racial situations in Brazil that a crucial factor in active prejudice is ". . . a feeling, on the part of the members of a dominant group, that they are *under threat of displacement from an established social position.*" "Race Prejudice as Revealed in the Study of Racial Situations," *International Social Science Bulletin,* Vol. 2, (1950), p. 473.

28. The National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital, *Segregation in Washington* (Chicago, 1948).
29. Myrdal and associates, and Carey McWilliams were early skeptics as to the "mores" doctrine. More recently, positive appraisals of the effectiveness of legislation have come from MacIver, Rose, Berger, and others. Robert M. MacIver, *The More Perfect Union* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948). Rose, *Ibid.*, pp. 545-555. Morroe Berger, *Equality by Statute: Legal Controls Over Group Discrimination* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952). Gunnar Myrdal, with the assistance of Richard Sterner and Arnold Rose, *An American Dilemma* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1944).
30. Cf: Gerhart Saenger and Norma S. Gordon: "The Influence of Discrimination on Minority Group Members in Its Relation to Attempts to Combat Discrimination," *Journal of Social Psychology,* Vol. 31, (1950).

PART II

SECTION B.

*Selected Research Studies**

The purpose of the previous section was to present a systematic appraisal of the relevance of various research approaches for the study of desegregation. The present section will describe three specific kinds of studies which, it is felt, would be most significant for an understanding of the process of desegregation. These are:

1. *Base-Line Studies.* A panel of 250-300 communities and their school systems, stratified by region, size of city, and ratio of white to Negro.
2. *Selected Community Studies.*
    - A. Case Studies of School Desegregation
    - B. Systematic Questionnaire Studies
        1. Before-and-after studies of adults
        2. Panel studies of students
        3. Surveys of teacher reactions
3. *Special Field Studies.*
    - A. Studies of overt conflict and violence
    - B. Studies of desegregation efforts that failed
    - C. Studies of unusually successful desegregation efforts

---

* The studies described in this section were originally prepared for discussion by an *ad hoc* Planning Committee on Research on Educational Change in the South.

CHAPTER 18.

Base-Line Studies

Social scientists interested in desegregation find themselves asking research questions such as the following—questions difficult to answer with data from just *one* community:

(a) How much variation is there in the social climate from one community to another in which the Supreme Court decision must be considered, and how is this reflected in subsequent events that facilitate or impede educational adjustment?

(b) What are the differences that account for some communities moving toward a swift compliance with the decision, other communities moving haltingly toward compliance, and still others strongly resisting compliance?

(c) If one plan for change-over is adopted rather than another, what differences are there in the ease of transition?

(d) What accounts for the outbreak of overt conflict and violence in some communities and not in others, and the ease or difficulty with which it is brought under control?

Among the main determinants of the processes of desegregation are administrative controls, organizational efforts (or their absence) by interested groups and minority organizations, and the operating policies of key policy makers, community lay leaders, and local school officials. In studying these determinants, each action effort, each minority organization, each leadership structure, becomes a sample of *one*. Bulking up enough cases to make valid comparisons requires research in community after community to accumulate comparative data.

Certain base-lines should be laid down for studying the marked changes that will take place in southern communities over the coming years as a result of the May, 1954 Supreme Court decision. Hopefully such studies would show in what kinds of communities, under what kinds of circumstances, and with what kind of leadership does orderly social change take place, as compared with those communities where change is shot through with disorder, conflict and violence. To yield valid scientific knowledge, these cross-community comparisons should be numerous enough to permit quantitative comparisons. A considerable body of valuable information can be gathered very efficiently from key informants in the community who themselves are the "natural" participant observers at the community level. Collecting useful data in this way depends heavily upon knowing what data are essential for answering the key research questions involved. This, in turn, requires enough familiarity with field situations to be able to ask the key research questions and to operationalize the data that will answer them.

These base-line studies would aim to gather data from three major sources:

(a) Data from key informants in the community at large. The aim would be to obtain information from influential leaders who were strategic to the promotion or prevention of desegregation, leaders of organizations that worked actively to promote or prevent desegregation, and minority leaders most actively engaged in the fight for desegregation. The basic purpose would be the orderly gathering of information on those aspects of community structure and functioning that would throw light on why and how communities A, B, and C move toward desegregation, while communities D, E, and F do not.

(b) Data from key school-system informants. Information would be gathered about the school system and, if and when desegregation is undertaken, about the details of the desegregation plan and the desegregation experiences. Superintendents of schools, principals, and strategic school teachers would be the main informants.

(c) Available community data. Helpful data could be assembled from existing records such as the census, county economic statistics, state school records, and other sources. Much of the data from the above sources could be gathered by correspondence and mail questionnaires. As the communities faced with the issue of desegregation move from a state of apathy to a state of indecision, to a state of action, the inquiry should be modified to keep pace with on-going change—since at each stage different informants or sources of data would be most relevant.

CHAPTER 19.

Selected Community Studies

The community-panel studies described above obviously cannot get enough intensive information to provide a penetrating understanding of the social changes that take place in a given community. For this purpose one could select from the larger panel a sub-sample of communities for intensive study. These communities should be selected to cover, as well as possible, the range of circumstances that are encountered in different sections of the South.

The southern states will probably divide into several groups in accordance with how strongly they are resisting or promoting desegregation. Areas can be selected to represent the range of these policies as well as to provide geographic variation. Within these areas, communities should be classified according to city size and ratio of Negro to white. A field team could then visit a number of potential communities in each of the areas to explore in more detail the appropriateness of different communities for intensive research.

Certain systematic information should be gathered in each of the communities that are candidates for more intensive study. This information should be designed to determine the relative stage of the community regarding the issue of desegregation, and the relevant details regarding such things as support and opposition, administrative plan for change-over, overt conflict and tension incidents, etc. The final selection of communities should permit variation in the stage of development, community leadership and school administration point of view. Communities of each of the following types should be included:

1. Communities where the local school administration favors desegregation and there is community support for it.

2. Communities where the school administration favors desegregation but there is substantial opposition to compliance.

3. Communities where the school administration opposes desegregation but there is actual or potential community support for it.

4. Communities where the local school administration opposes desegregation and there is also substantial community opposition to it.

In these communities two kinds of studies could be made: (A) case studies of school desegregation, and (B) systematic questionnaire studies.

A. Case Studies of School Desegregation

The aim of the studies would be to get a thorough understanding of the community processes involved in desegregation. The case studies should deal with three major stages of development.

1. The community processes leading up to the decision to desegregate or to resist desegregation.
2. The administrative processes of change-over from segregation to non-segregation.
3. The after-effects of desegregation on other aspects of community life (i.e., desegregation of the playgrounds, swimming pools, etc.).

The main techniques involved would be unstructured interviewing and observation by field workers continuously in contact with the field situation. In these case studies, trained field workers should aim continuously to redirect the inquiry on the basis of data coming in as a result of the field work to even more fruitful areas of investigation. Changes in the research direction need to be made in order to gather data more critical for the emerging hypotheses. Each field situation should be explored in a way that would yield the most helpful qualitative data. The aim would be a flexible and skillful guiding of unpatterned field work in order to deepen the research understanding by taking account of the individual peculiarities of the field situation.

The field workers should aim to establish good working relationships with school administrators, community leaders, and the officers of organizations trying to promote or resist desegregation in order to piece together from the testimony of participants and witnesses a meaningful picture of how the forces of community change develop. The details of how school desegregation takes place within a given school system should be carefully documented and compared, from one community to another. Various methods and techniques for desegregation should be described, including an account of the actual procedure by which the technique was introduced and carried through. Incidents taking place in the schools should be documented. Such reports on the process of desegregation should come from all levels; school administrator, teachers, pupils, school organizations, etc.

The case studies of the actual planning and accomplishment of the change-over to non-segregated schooling would profit especially from being set up on a comparative basis. How did the way *this* school system handled it compare with the way *that* school system handled it? Since, in each community, data would be gathered on, say, how teacher reassignments are made, the data should enable one to make inferences on what the consequences are of technique "A" versus technique "B."

Crucial areas to be documented might include: (a) the firmness or laxity with which policy and procedure are announced and communicated; (b) the clarity of specification of objectives; (c) the amount of voluntary choice permitted white and Negro students and its effects; (d) the teachers' perception of what is expected of them; (e) the amount of staff anxiety, the concerns it creates, in turn, and the administrators' handling of it; (f) the extent of participation of staff, both white and Negro, in the details of change-over.

B. *Systematic Questionnaire Studies*

Questionnaire studies of three kinds could be made.

1. *Before-and-after cross-section surveys with the adult population.* These cross-section studies would serve the following purposes:

(a) Provide an understanding of how the general population is involved in the community changes concerning desegregation. These studies should obtain the public's perceptions of the school situation, their attitudes on matters relating to desegregation, and the extent of their participation in the process.

(b) These sudies would make possible cross-community comparisons of public reactions. Where the relationships established in one community do not hold in another community, we would have important data on the variation in intergroup relations from one social environment to another. The qualitative data on community structure and functioning could provide clues for the interpretation of these variations.

(c) For certain types of relationships that are relatively invariant from one community to another, these cross-section studies would provide verification of findings.

(d) The cross-section data would provide attitudinal and behavioral base lines for studying the impact of school desegregation and other community changes on individuals over the next decade or so. Since the communities in which these cross-section studies would be made represent a range of southern communities, we would gain some understanding of the differential impact of desegregation on different types of social environments. Such base lines would permit an orderly understanding of how important community changes permeate the thinking and behavior of the members of a community.

(e) These cross-section studies could provide information that would be useful to community leaders in interpreting or explaining certain features of the school-desegregation process to the community at large. One could gain increased understanding of where misconceptions and resistances were most serious.

2. *Student-panel studies.* School desegregation offers unparalleled natural experimental opportunities. Panel studies of students, in which the same students answer questionnaires before and after desegregation, would be virtually experimental studies. The mixing of students would be the experimental stimulus and the changes in student attitudes and behavior would be the effect. In certain field situations, where some of the schools in a system remain unaffected by desegregation, there would even be the possibility of using control groups. With students accustomed to taking paper and pencil tests, the questionnaire instrument could easily be administered by the researcher or by cooperating teachers.

These data would make detailed and significant quantitative comparisons of students possible, according to their differential characteristics or experiences. Several different areas of study appear to be important:

(a) *Academic adjustment of students.* It will be especially important to understand the academic adjustments of students who have been handicapped by inferior preparation when they are mixed together in classrooms with students who have had much better preparation. The instruments used in these panel studies would probably incorporate academic-achievement items, school attendance and extracurricular records, psychological and social adjustment items, items designed to tap certain personality variables, and, of course, items specifying the social characteristics and background of the students. Important information can be added to the questionnaire data from school records. If these studies cover a range of school situations, the findings might have immediate practical value for school administrators eager to insure the most rapid and effective adjustment in their classroom.

(b) *Studies of interaction, friendship formation, and attitude change.* Accumulated evidence of current studies indicates the importance of studying interaction and friendship formation across race lines in relation to articulated prejudices and recurring contact opportunities. We do not as yet understand the *specifics* of the contact opportunity situation that are most conducive or disruptive to friendly interaction. We need to specify interaction and contact as a process—a process that moves from mere physical proximity to initial gestures of friendliness or unfriendliness, then to various types of interaction, and finally to the establishment of friendship or its absence.

There is abundant evidence to indicate that interaction between the races, in any given environment, is generally associated with the level of prejudice, but we have very little understanding of how interaction modifies prejudice. Prejudice seems to break down into a number of sub-dimensions; and some of these sub-dimensions appear to be readily modified by interaction, while others persist relatively unchanged despite interaction. We need increased specification of these different sub-dimensions and their relationship to different types of interaction.

These student-panel studies could throw light on another area—the carry-over of interaction and friendship formation in the school setting to other situations outside the school. Available evidence indicates that desegregation is followed by a very limited amount of such carry-over into non-school situations. We need to know much more about the circumstances under which there is or is not this carry-over.

(c) *Personality Studies.* The questionnaire instruments used in the student panels should include items that index different aspects of personality. This would make it possible to determine what aspects of personality, if any, are affected by experiences in non-segregated environments. In addition, it would tell what kinds of personality characteristics make for easy adjustment to a non-segregated environment, and which are associated with difficulties in adjustment.

Student panel studies, in addition to providing data on the differential experiences of individual students under desegregation, could serve another important purpose; comparisons of student reactions from one school to another would be made possible. Since different schools and different communities would be compared by the case-study method as to how the issue of desegregation was handled, it would become possible, through the student panels, to compare student reactions to these different administrative procedures and the types of social environment that they create. Thus, by comparing matched groups of students from different schools, we could gain insight into the impact of different social environments on people having the same social and personal characteristics.

3. *Surveys of Teacher Reactions.* Where a school system is cooperating on a study of desegregation, the opportunity would exist to obtain uniform data from both white and Negro teachers. Several different kinds of data would be worth gathering: (a) teacher reactions to the method of handling desegregation; (b) recollections of expectations and anxieties about what would happen; (c) unfulfilled expectations and unanticipated occurrences that were difficult to handle; (d) tension incidents and the circumstances that surrounded them; (e) reactions to teaching mixed classes and working with a mixed staff; (f) teacher perceptions of students' reaction and problems of student adjustment.

In the optimum sitation, it might be possible to interlock teacher and student questionnaires so that the research could get at the reactions of different types of teachers to different classroom settings, and the reactions of different kinds of students to different types of teachers. Since in many ways the teachers will be the key figures in the educational adjustment once desegregation is under way, the findings of surveys of teachers should have important practical consequences.

Every effort should be made to interweave and interlock each of these different types of quantitative studies with the non-quantitative case-study data. In the optimum situation, the relationship between case-study data in community studies and questionnaire data would be this:

(1) The unstructured inquiry would produce: (a) hypotheses for verification by questionnaire data; (b) insights for interpretation of questionnaire data; and (c) examples for illustration, dramatization, and validation of questionnaire data.

(2) The major functions of the questionnaire method would be: (a) verification of these hunches and hypotheses; (b) the establishment of quantitative relationships that cannot be apprehended by unstructured methods; and (c) the production of essential base-line information such as, say, an inventory of contacts between minority—and majority-group members.

The selected community studies should offer optimum opportunities for tying together both the qualitative and the quantitative data.

CHAPTER 20.

Special Field Studies

In the case of desegregation, where the course of events is so unpredictable from one state to another and from one community to another, an effort should be made to learn as much as is possible from especially illuminating situations, whenever and wherever they occur. Special field workers could be assigned to this kind of task and could be prepared on short notice to go into new field situations where research appears promising.

Perhaps at the beginning these studies would be primarily reconnaissance. But as special interests and critical hypotheses emerge from the base-line studies and from the selected community studies, these special field studies could become more systematic. The selected community studies could be expected to produce, out of their more intensive involvement in the processes of desegregation: (1) those crucial variables on which more information is needed, and (2) operational procedures for studying them quickly. If field situations are scrutinized for optimum comparable situations, in which most of the community variables are parallel and the main differences are one- or two-key variables on which more information is needed, these special field studies can become increasingly more systematic.

Thus, the flexibility involved in the special field studies would be used to redirect the inquiry to critical cases, with special testing relevant to emerging formulated hypotheses. Although the specific subject matter and hypotheses of these field studies would in part emerge from the on-going research, from our present knowledge at least, the following major areas appear to be important:

A. *Studies of overt conflict and violence.* Since to understand the origins of overt conflict and violence, and their control is so important to the achievement of an orderly adjustment to the Supreme Court ruling, and since the occurrence of overt conflict and violence is unpredictable and likely to occur outside of selected communities, systematic "quickie" studies should probably be begun as soon as possible in this area of inquiry.

B. *Studies of desegregation efforts that deteriorated.* We have already seen instances of initial efforts at desegregation folding up in the face of flare-ups of opposition. We do not understand to what extent these reversals were necessary in order to prevent serious violence, or how much of the conflict may have been a result of maladministration, lack of appropriate preparation in the community, etc. Therefore, an understanding of the dynamics of orderly transition depends on pinpointing these variables.

C. *Studies of unusually successful desegregation efforts.* Where communities have accomplished desegregation in the face of stiff opposition, or where desegregation has had important integrating effects on other areas of community life, special field studies of the circumstances would also seem indicated.